

GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

# Bulletin



General Editor Andreas Gestrich

Editors	Angela Davies Jane Rafferty	Valeska Huber Markus Mösslang Michael Schaich Jochen Schenk
---------	--------------------------------	--

German Historical Institute, 17 Bloomsbury Square,  
London WC1A 2NJ

Tel: 020 7309 2050

Fax: 020 7404 5573

e-mail: [ghil@ghil.ac.uk](mailto:ghil@ghil.ac.uk)

Homepage: [www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)

Opening hours of the Institute Library:

Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday	10.00–17.00
Thursday	10.00–20.00

Enquiries should be directed to the Librarians

Tel: 020 7309 2019/2022/2039

The *GHIL Bulletin* appears twice each year  
and is available free on request

ISSN 0269-8552 (print)

ISSN 3049-9135 (online)

Cover design: Lucy Schönberger

Photograph: John Goldblatt

# German Historical Institute London

## Bulletin

Volume XXXIV, No. 1

May 2012

### CONTENTS

#### *Special Theme*

- Objects and Emotions: Loss and Acquisition of Jewish  
Property (Andreas Gestrich and Daniel Wildmann) 4

#### **Articles**

- Emblems and Heirlooms. Restitution, Reparation, and the  
Subjective Value of Chattels: A Legal Perspective  
(Norman Palmer) 8
- Diasporic Home or Homelessness: The Museum and the  
Circle of Lost and Found (Hanno Loewy) 41
- Family Files: Emotions and Stories of (Non-)Restitution  
(Atina Grossmann) 59

#### **Review Article**

- Objects and Emotions Exhibited: Two Catalogues on *Raub und  
Restitution* (Chloe Paver) 79

#### **Book Reviews**

- Frank Rexroth (ed.), *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der Gelehrten  
im späten Mittelalter* (Hannah Skoda) 88
- Thomas Brockmann, *Dynastie, Kaiseramt und Konfession: Politik  
und Ordnungsvorstellungen Ferdinands II. im Dreißigjährigen  
Krieg* (Peter H. Wilson) 94

(cont.)

## Contents

Andrew C. Thompson, <i>George II: King and Elector</i> (Ulrich Niggemann)	98
Benno Gammerl, <i>Untertanen, Staatsbürger und Andere: Der Umgang mit ethnischer Heterogenität im Britischen Weltreich und im Habsburgerreich 1867–1918</i> (R. J. W. Evans)	102
Norbert Friedrich, Uwe Kaminsky, and Roland Löffler (eds.), <i>The Social Dimension of Christian Missions in the Middle East: Historical Studies of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries</i> (Catriona Laing)	106
Anne Sudrow, <i>Der Schuh im Nationalsozialismus: Eine Produktgeschichte im deutsch–britisch–amerikanischen Vergleich</i> (Neil Gregor)	113
Dietmar Süß, <i>Tod aus der Luft: Kriegsgesellschaft und Luftkrieg in Deutschland und England</i> (Stefan Goebel)	118
Olaf Blaschke, <i>Verleger machen Geschichte: Buchhandel und Historiker seit 1945 im deutsch–britischen Vergleich</i> (Stephan Petzold)	123
Christian L. Glossner, <i>The Making of the German Post-War Economy: Political Communication and Public Reception of the Social Market Economy after World War Two</i> (Jan-Otmar Hesse)	126
Paul Betts, <i>Within Walls: Private Life in the German Democratic Republic</i> (Dorothee Wierling)	129
Janet Ward, <i>Post-Wall Berlin: Borders, Space and Identity</i> (Hanno Hochmuth)	132
<b>Conference Reports</b>	
Crime and Punishment: Criminal Justice in Modern Europe, 1870–1990 (Richard F. Wetzell)	136
The Dilemmas of International Humanitarian Aid in the Twentieth Century (Johannes Paulmann)	143
The Cold War: History, Memory, and Representation (Jula Danylow, Jasmin Heermann, Claudia Schumacher, Andreas Etges)	160
Staging Empire: New Perspectives on the 1911 Coronation Durbar and Imperial Assemblage (Justin Siefert)	165
The Fischer Controversy Fifty Years On (Annika Mombauer)	169
Medieval History Seminar (Jan-Hendryk de Boer)	176

*Contents*

Listening Spaces: Art Music and its Audiences in the Concert Hall and Beyond, c.1850–1945 (Neil Gregor)	180
Sport in Early Modern Culture (Amelie Rösinger and Angela Schattner)	185
Screen Culture and the Social Question: Poverty on Screen 1880–1914 (Lydia Jakobs)	191
Ninth Workshop on Early Modern Central European History (Linnéa Rowlatt)	197
<b>Noticeboard</b>	203
<b>Library News</b>	
Recent Acquisitions	210

## **OBJECTS AND EMOTIONS: LOSS AND ACQUISITION OF JEWISH PROPERTY**

ANDREAS GESTRICH AND DANIEL WILDMANN

Over the past decade the history of emotions has established itself as a rapidly developing field of research. It is one of the theoretically most challenging approaches to history, and also highly controversial.<sup>1</sup> The expanding debate on the history of emotions and their importance in history has so far focused primarily on emotions in interpersonal relations and mass psychology. It has tended to ignore a related debate which has also recently given rise to intense academic discussion, namely, the new history of objects and material culture (*Objektkultur*). This field, closely linked to museum studies and the history of memory and memorialization, explores the multi-layered relations between individuals and objects,<sup>2</sup> including the emotional qualities some objects can acquire for people.

The idea of bringing these two debates together grew out of an anecdote recounted by Saul Friedländer at a workshop held at the Leo Baeck Institute in 2007 to mark the publication of the final volume of his trilogy on Nazi Germany and the Jews.<sup>3</sup> Friedländer mentioned a family which had acquired bedding from the possessions of deported Jews. They were unable to use this bedding, however, and kept it locked away in a wardrobe. Now in the second generation,

<sup>1</sup> For introductory texts see e.g. Keith Oatley, *Emotions: A Brief History* (Oxford, 2004); Ute Frevert, 'Was haben Gefühle in der Geschichte zu suchen?', in ead. (ed.), *Geschichte der Gefühle*, special issue of *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 35 (2009), 183–208.

<sup>2</sup> Lorraine Daston (ed.), *Things that Talk: Object Lessons from Art and Science* (New York, 2004), 9–24; Gudrun M. König (ed.), *Alltagsdinge: Erkundungen der materiellen Kultur* (Tübingen, 2005); Judy Attfield, *Wild Things: The Material Culture of Everyday Life* (New York, 2000); Anke te Heesen and Petra Lutz (eds.), *Dingwelten: Das Museum als Erkenntnisort* (Cologne, 2005). See also the conference: 'Objects of Affection: Towards a Materiology of Emotions', Interdisciplinary Conference, 4–6 May 2012, Princeton University.

<sup>3</sup> Saul Friedländer, *Nazi Germany and the Jews*, iii. *The Years of Extermination: A Plea for an Integrated History of the Holocaust* (New York, 2007).

they had been able neither to use it, nor give it away, nor destroy it. This bedding was at the centre of intense emotions which spanned and linked generations in the feeling of guilt, perhaps also of fear and sadness.

Conversations on this and similar narratives gave rise to the idea that a workshop<sup>4</sup> on the different emotional qualities of and relation to such objects could add a valuable new dimension to the study of the loss and appropriation of Jewish property. It might also make interesting inroads into an aspect of the evolving field of the history of emotions that has not so far been prominent, namely, the emotional quality of and relation to material objects.

The organizers of the workshop were able to draw on the fact that over the past two decades a number of excellent local studies of the expropriation and Aryanization of Jewish property have increased our understanding not only of what happened, but also how it happened, and especially the parts which individuals, neighbours, former friends, party officials, local policemen, and so on played in the expropriation and appropriation of Jewish property. We were also able to draw on more recent, wider experience with individual and collective reactions and emotions in the context of the restitution and contested restitution of Jewish property over recent decades.<sup>5</sup>

We invited historians as well as colleagues from literary, museum, and film studies, European ethnology, and law to approach these problems and perspectives. The writer Gila Lustiger, who read and discussed the story of her grandmother's paperweight which

<sup>4</sup> The workshop, entitled 'Objects and Emotions: Loss and Acquisition of Jewish Property', was co-organized by the German Historical Institute London and the Leo Baeck Institute and held at the GHIL on 26-7 July 2010. The full programme can be found on the GHIL's website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

<sup>5</sup> See also the two exhibition catalogues on this topic, reviewed below by Chloe Paver in this issue of the *GHIL Bulletin*: Inka Bertz and Michael Dorrmann (eds.), *Raub und Restitution: Kulturgut aus jüdischem Besitz von 1933 bis heute* (Göttingen, 2008); and Alexandra Reininghaus (ed.), *Recollecting: Raub und Restitution* (Vienna, 2009). The famous legal case of Michel Levi-Leleu, whose father, Pierre Levi, was murdered at Auschwitz and who detected his father's suitcase in an exhibition of the Paris Memorial de la Shoah, also provides many insights into the emotional importance of objects in this context.

## Objects and Emotions

forms part of her family novel *So sind wir*, was also invited.<sup>6</sup> The workshop was very much exploratory in character. It was not intended as the basis for a volume of collected essays. There were some papers, however, which we thought could inspire further discussion. These are published in the organizers' respective journals, the *Leo Baeck Institute Yearbook* and the *German Historical Institute London Bulletin*. The first of the three papers assembled here deals with issues of emotions in legal restitution processes of Jewish possessions; the second looks at the life of such objects in museums; and the third is a personal account by a professional historian whose family was a victim of Nazi persecution and Aryanization policy.

In his article 'Emblems and Heirlooms. Restitution, Reparation, and the Subjective Value of Chattels: A Legal Perspective' Norman Palmer analyses the importance the law accords 'the unique subjective value of individual objects to specific claimants'. He approaches this topic first from a general perspective by looking at litigation surrounding personal chattels and then turns to Holocaust-related objects. In particular, Palmer draws on cases dealt with by the British Government's Spoliation Advisory Panel, which has a certain bias towards more valuable objects, especially looted art. Taking these cases and recommendations as a starting point, he is able to demonstrate the courts' increasing recognition of the emotional importance of objects to their former owners and their descendants.

In the second article, 'Diasporic Home or Homelessness: The Museum and the Circle of Lost and Found', Hanno Loewy reflects on the 'context of material memory, the trajectory of meanings, emotions, and affections attached to objects of everyday life'. He elaborates on a specific set of ambiguities which objects attain when they enter the space of the museum, namely, that between the sacred and the profane (museums take objects originally created for the purpose of religious cult and practice and make them profane); that between past and present (in objects we can perceive the physical presence of the past); and that between biography and history, when objects are taken out of the personal contexts in which they were created and used, and serve as examples for wider historical interpretations. Loewy exemplifies these ambiguities by tracing the history of various objects in the context of this analytical framework.

<sup>6</sup> Gila Lustiger, *So sind wir: Ein Familienroman* (Berlin, 2005).



The third article, by Atina Grossmann, presents a historian's reflections on her and her family's personal experiences with persecution, terror, and loss of life, chances, careers, and property, as well as their struggle for compensation and restitution. The article is an emotional one. This portrayal of the experience of bourgeois Berlin Jews highlights how hurt and frustrated those who narrowly escaped the Nazi extermination camps were by Germany's post-war bureaucracy defending the Aryanizers and their 'possessions', often by employing hair-splitting legalistic procedures with overtly anti-Semitic tendencies. It is therefore not only the immediate emotional value of the object itself, but also encounters in law suits, personal conversations, and correspondences that entangle victims, perpetrators, and their descendants in a shared, albeit antagonistic, relationship with such contested objects.

All three articles show, each in its specific way, how multi-layered is the topic of objects and emotions. This is especially obvious when one analyses, as Atina Grossmann does, how the emotional quality of such objects metamorphoses across generations. In any case, all three articles amply demonstrate that analysing the emotional relationship of victims and perpetrators with certain objects which bind them together is central to a better understanding of the complex fabric of German-Jewish relations before, during, and after the years of Nazi terror and legalized theft. The theoretical tools for a systematic analysis of these emotions are not yet well developed. The three articles presented here in many ways explore territory that has been ignored by the evolving field of history and theory of emotions. The sources they present and reflect on, however, leave no doubt that this is a field worthy of intensive interdisciplinary research.

## ARTICLES

### ***EMBLEMS AND HEIRLOOMS. RESTITUTION, REPARATION, AND THE SUBJECTIVE VALUE OF CHATTELS: A LEGAL PERSPECTIVE***

NORMAN PALMER

People need to have a past, because it provides a sense of security, roots; it imparts self-worth, identity. We don't notice it when it is there, we consider it a matter of course, but it is not. Children continue to look throughout their lifetime for the father or mother they have never known simply because they need to know where they come from. They will go to any lengths. Adopted children travel back to the country where they were born. Where there is a past, there is a future.<sup>1</sup>

#### *Introduction: The Intangible Dimensions of Tangible Things*

Tangible objects come in many guises. Some draw their value from subjective association alone. The plainest thing is precious when it has personal meaning. A letter or a photograph, a wedding ring, a child's tooth, even a seaside souvenir, can revive memories and inspire joy or grief. The loss of such an item can be bitterly mourned.

Such things rarely have commercial appeal. They seldom appear at auction or in museums. Nor do they possess that ineffable mys-

The author thanks Kate Hawken and Ji-Shuen Loong for editorial assistance in producing this article.

<sup>1</sup> J. P. Sigmond, 'Some Thoughts on the Importance of Cultural Heritage and the Protection of Cultural Goods', *Art, Antiquity and Law*, 10 (2005), 63-71, at 67, paraphrasing David Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country* (Cambridge, 1986).

tique that attaches to great art.<sup>2</sup> Their value lies in their subjective or symbolic resonance. They are cherished because they enshrine memories and form part of a person's identity or make-up. They may be the only surviving trace of a family's history. They may even sum up a whole life.

The vitality of such an object may be unknown to anyone other than the person who senses it. A fictional example is the child's sled 'Rosebud', the name of which was on Charles Foster Kane's lips as he died. The word recalled a childhood loss, still poignant to a dying man some sixty years on. Only he recalled the day when, as a child, he was parted from his family, and his plaything was taken from him. The secret of its meaning died with him. In that case, as in so many, a humdrum chattel represented a lost life and a lost world.

In no context, perhaps, can this symbolism be more potent or poignant than that of chattels owned by families scattered and ravaged by the Holocaust. In such a case the object may be the sole tangible reminder of a life irretrievably erased or scarred by murder, persecution, or displacement: 'a bridge back to a world destroyed.'<sup>3</sup> It is hard to imagine a more poignant tale of symbolic association than that of the suitcase, discovered by Mr Michel Levi-Leleu in 2005

<sup>2</sup> The nature of art has engaged the attention of philosophers as well as jurists. Prominent critics in this regard are Immanuel Kant and Leo Tolstoy: see the latter's *What is Art?* trans. Richard Pevear and Larissa Volokhonsky (London, 1995). Professor Stephen Guest has suggested in 'The Value of Art', *Art, Antiquity and Law*, 7 (2002), 305-16, at 307 that the value of art 'is to be found in the value of its own existence, independent of its doing anything for us. We admire art because of this independent value, and so admire it as "art for art's sake". Looking at art this way introduces us to art's austere quality, through which we respect art, not for anything it "does" for us, but because understanding it properly requires understanding something of importance, perhaps great importance about the world. And so we say that we want to look at a painting by Van Gogh because it is wonderful, not that it is wonderful because we want to look at it. This way of looking at art borrows from the great German philosopher Kant, who not only asserted art's independent value, but took the point even further. The appreciation of art, he thought, was akin to moral appreciation and capable of expressing our highest aspirations.'

<sup>3</sup> The phrase is that of Edward Serotta, 'Preserving Jewish Memory', *The Library of Rescued Memories: Pictures and Stories from the Centropa Interviews in the Czech Republic* (Vienna, 2009), 14-16, at 14.

## Articles

at an exhibition at the Shoah Memorial Museum in Paris where it had arrived on loan from the collections of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum in Oswiecim. He claimed that the suitcase had belonged to his father Pierre Levi, who was murdered at Auschwitz and whose name and address ('86 Boul, Villette, Paris Pierre Levi') were inscribed on a tag attached to the object. To many, the argument for restitution was compelling: principles of property, inheritance, tradition, and the redress of wrongdoing collectively appealed for the return of the thing to Pierre Levi's descendants. But even so graphic an instance of subjective association embodied more complex values. The Auschwitz-Birkenau Museum resisted the return to the family on the ground that the suitcase no longer symbolized the experience of a single family alone. It had taken on a new character as a metaphor of the panoply of wrongs committed against the Jewish population of Europe in the years 1933 to 1945. Thus interpreted, the suitcase had a part to play in the transcendent imperative to ensure that those evils were never forgotten.<sup>4</sup>

Of course the history or hinterland of an everyday thing may increase its monetary worth. Ordinary things intersect with great people or great events. We are accustomed to see inherently mundane articles achieve high prices because they once belonged to somebody famous or reflect some historic occasion. The 'royal or romantic' association of an item of jewellery, we are told, may great-

<sup>4</sup> In the words of the Press Release, issued when the claim was settled in 2009: 'The International Auschwitz Council . . . contended that everything left from the camp should remain inviolate and integral . . . The suitcases belonging to people deported to Auschwitz are among the most priceless material testimony to the tragedy that occurred here. They constitute a small remainder of the property left behind by the victims of the gas chambers, and the names on some of them are among the few proofs of the death of specific individuals in Auschwitz . . . [T]he Auschwitz Museum . . . regards the suitcase as one of the rare objects symbolizing and representing the memory of the persons deported to the camp, and . . . wishes to express the deepest understanding of the emotions of the families of Shoah victims.' Under the settlement, the Auschwitz-Birkenau Museum decided to leave the suitcase in the Paris Shoah museum on a long-term basis. Mr Levi-Leleu's family, in turn, renounced its claims. See 'Settlement reached over Auschwitz Suitcases' in the News 2009 section of *Memorial and Museum: Auschwitz-Birkenau* <en.auschwitz.org/m/index.php?option=com\_content&task>, accessed 28 Feb. 2012.

ly increase its desirability to investors and connoisseurs.<sup>5</sup> Earlier this century, the bullet-pierced windscreen of the Austro-Daimler in which the Archduke Franz Ferdinand and his morganatic wife the Countess Sophie Chotek were murdered at Sarajevo was consigned for auction at an estimated 2,300 euros, though 'it probably sold for considerably more'.<sup>6</sup> Objects associated with Adolf Hitler may be a macabre and tainted class of memorabilia, but the market for them is by no means stagnant.<sup>7</sup>

Converting celebrity value into money is an elusive enterprise. Such value can, however, be objectively verified, whether through competitive bidding at auction or other professional processes. By contrast, the more private and personal items that reflect a lost childhood or family may have no commercial worth at all, or at least none worth litigating over. In general, they are unlikely to find their way into a museum. Even if they do enter a museum their commercial worth remains low. Their value lies in their memories, and those memories may be secret.

One aim of this article is to evaluate the relative importance of such subjective association in the eyes of the law. The article considers the question both in the general context of personal property and through the specific prism of Holocaust-related objects. It seeks to inquire how far our approach to the restitution of Holocaust material reflects and respects the unique subjective value of individual objects to specific claimants, whether these are individuals, families, or nations.

### *General Litigation Surrounding Personal Chattels*

#### *Personal Objects: Does the Law Endow them with Special Value?*

The common law of England is not a sentimental institution. One can cite numerous cases where judges have subordinated individual jus-

<sup>5</sup> *Jabir v. H Jordan & Co* (unreported, 13 Dec. 2010) upheld by the Court of Appeal [2011] EWCA Civ 816.

<sup>6</sup> Sigmond, 'Some Thoughts on the Importance of Cultural Heritage', 65.

<sup>7</sup> For recent instances of proposed sales of such material, see 'Auction Row over Hitler Desk Set on which the Munich Pact was Signed', *Daily Telegraph*, 15 Nov. 2011; 'Hitler's Sheet to be Sold', *The Times*, 24 Nov. 2011.

## Articles

tice to the relentless dictates of legal principle.<sup>8</sup> But the law is not without compassion in the context of human relationships with chattels. For example, when granting compensation for the violation of a chattel (typically by theft, damage, or unlawful detention) modern courts sometimes pay regard to an individual's personal association with that chattel.<sup>9</sup> Where damages are sought against the wrongdoer the sum awarded may thus exceed the market worth of the object.<sup>10</sup>

A recurrent medium for such awards is litigation over pet animals. Older case law was reluctant to award more than the objective value of a family pet. In Tasmania in 1927, for example, the Supreme Court awarded a mere £2 Australian for the loss of a pet cat that had been unlawfully shot by a neighbour.<sup>11</sup> Later authority seems more willing to accept that the owner's loss may include an element of quantifiable subjective value. In Canada, damages to reflect an owner's sentimental attachment to a cherished pet have been awarded against an airline through whose default one dog was killed and

<sup>8</sup> e.g. Mr Justice Littledale in *Balme v Hutton* (1833) 9 Bing, 471 at 507: 'I think the hardship of a case ought not to form a principle on which the law should act. Society is so formed, that many people fill relations which appear to induce great hardships. If these hardships be of sufficient importance for the legislature to interfere, they will do so.' In the same case at 512 Mr Justice Park said: 'The hardship . . . can be no argument if the law be clear . . . the Court must be governed by the principles of law, and not by the hardship of any particular case.' See also, among numerous similar remarks, those of Mr Justice Patteson and Baron Alderson in *Garland v Carlisle* (1837) 4 Cl & Fin 693 at 740-1 and 747 respectively. These and other cases are discussed in Norman Palmer and Ruth Redmond-Cooper (eds.), *Taking it Personally: The Individual Liability of Museum Personnel* (Builth Wells: Institute of Art and Law, 2011).

<sup>9</sup> Sometimes they will also inquire whether the violation was vindictive as opposed to inadvertent. This may affect liability and/or the damages awarded. For an early case see *Whittingham v Ideson* (1861) 8 Upp Can LJ 14; Norman Palmer and Anthony Hudson, 'Damages for Distress and Loss of Enjoyment in Claims involving Chattels', in Norman Palmer and Evan McKendrick (eds.), *Interests in Goods* (2nd edn. London, 1998), ch. 34, 867-95, at 882 n.98.

<sup>10</sup> For a detailed older analysis of Commonwealth and US case law in this field, see *ibid.* ch. 34.

<sup>11</sup> *Davies v Bennison* [1927] Tas LR 52.

another severely injured,<sup>12</sup> or a boarding kennel that allowed a dog to escape, from which adventure it never returned.<sup>13</sup> The latter case was cited with approval in a controversial recent decision in an English immigration appeal about an asylum seeker who relied on his acquisition of a cat in England as evidence that he had put down roots in England and developed a family life.<sup>14</sup>

Such awards remain rare and one should be wary of overstating them. Moreover, they are generally modest in quantum.<sup>15</sup> But a comparable logic is reflected in cases about inanimate chattels. It has, for example, been held reasonable for the owner of a car to which the owner attached exceptional sentimental importance, and on which he had lavished exceptional attention over the period of his ownership, to spend a greater sum in reinstating the car to its former condition after it was negligently damaged than the amount of its resultant market value. Where the owner of a much-loved MG car named 'Mademoiselle Hortensia' spent a substantial sum in having the car repaired following its damage through the collapse of scaffolding, he was allowed to recover that sum against the scaffolding company whose negligence had led to the damage. The claim succeeded des-

<sup>12</sup> *Newell v Canadian Pacific Airlines Ltd* (1976) 14 OR (2d) 752; and see *Watt v Logan* (1945) 61 Sh Ct Rep 155 at 158.

<sup>13</sup> *Ferguson and Hagans v Birchmount Boarding Kennels Ltd and Robert Jones and Bert Barrett* (2006) 79 OR 681; and see *Borza v Banner* (1975) 60 DLR (3d) 604; *Somerville v Malloy* [1999] OJ No 428.

<sup>14</sup> Decision of Immigration Judge Mr J. R. Devittie at para 15: 'The evidence concerning the joint acquisition of Maya [the cat] by the appellant and his partner reinforces my conclusion on the strength and quality of family life that the appellant and his partner enjoy . . . The Canadian courts have moved away from the legal view that animals are merely chattels, to a recognition that they play an important part in the lives of their owners and that the loss of a pet has a significant impact on its owner.'

<sup>15</sup> In other contexts the amount of an award for personal anguish caused by a defendant's wrongdoing can be substantial. A vivid example in the field of cultural property is the award of 80,000 NIS for the personal anguish caused to the scholar Elisha Qimron by the violation of his copyright and moral right relating to the defendants' publication of the 'Deciphered Text' produced from the Hidden Scrolls (or Dead Sea Scrolls): *Eisenman v Qimron; Shanks, Robinson and the Biblical Archaeological Society v Qimron* (29 Aug. 2000), a decision of the Supreme Court of Israel sitting as the Appellate Court for Civil Appeals.

## Articles

pite the defendant's argument that the car was beyond economic repair and the proper result would have been to write the car off and allow the owner its market value immediately before the damage.<sup>16</sup> Mr Justice Edmund Davies observed that the claimant had owned the car for thirteen years, had devoted himself to its care and maintenance over that time, and clearly believed that 'there was no other car like it'. These factors entitled the claimant to recover the greater cost of repairing the car, unless it was unreasonable for him to pursue that course as opposed to replacing it. The burden of proving that repair was an unreasonable option lay on the defendant and the defendant had not discharged it.<sup>17</sup>

Other cases are in line with this approach.<sup>18</sup> The loss of a rosary through the defendant's want of due care resulted in damages to represent its sentimental value.<sup>19</sup> The negligent loss of a long-standing stamp and glass collection built up almost from childhood led to an award of damages to represent the owner's distress and injured feelings.<sup>20</sup>

Compared to the ravages suffered by Holocaust victims these cases may seem trivial, but that, in a sense, is the point. If the law is prepared to award damages for the personal hurt suffered through the loss of a treasured thing in conditions that fall infinitely short of the terrors of the Holocaust, it could hardly object in principle to a subjective measure of compensation for an owner whose whole family or way of life had been destroyed.

<sup>16</sup> *O'Grady v Westminster Scaffolding* [1962] 2 Lloyd's Rep 238; Palmer and Hudson, 'Damages for Distress', 889-90. And see *Scobie v Wing* (1992) 2 WWR 514; Palmer and Hudson, 'Damages for Distress', 892-4.

<sup>17</sup> As to the general requirement that damages founded on the cost of reinstatement (as opposed to diminution in value) must be reasonable in order to be recoverable, see *Ruxley Electronics and Construction Ltd v Forsyth* [1996] AC 344 (swimming pool) and the archive case of *Aerospace Publishing Ltd v Thames Water Utilities Ltd* [2007] EWCA Civ 3, below p. 17.

<sup>18</sup> e.g. *Piper v Darling* (1940) 67 LL L Rep 419 at 423 per Mr Justice Langton (damages reflecting an 'element of sentiment and predilection' in regard to a negligently damaged yacht); Palmer and Hudson 'Damages for Distress', 877 n. 70.

<sup>19</sup> *Zien v Queen* (1984) 20 DLR (4<sup>th</sup>) 283 at 294-5.

<sup>20</sup> *Graham v Voight* (1989) 95 FLR 146; and see Norman Palmer (ed.), *Palmer on Bailment* (3rd edn. London, 2009), para 37-046.



Again, however, such cases should be approached with caution. There are decisions on the other side of the line,<sup>21</sup> though mainly of an older vintage.<sup>22</sup> The leading case on damages for disappointment involved a claim for breach of contract,<sup>23</sup> and says nothing about the sort of liability that might arise, for example, in tort, where a defendant steals a chattel of sentimental value or, having acquired first possession of it in good faith, refuses to surrender it, in defiance of the owner's enduring title.

*Specific Redelivery and Injunction*

The principle of subjective association is not, however, entirely novel. As early as *Somerset v Cookson*<sup>24</sup> in 1735 we find the judge observing that it would be 'very hard' if somebody who came by an object of antiquity through trespass or other wrong 'should have it in his power to keep the thing paying only the intrinsic value'. In fact this was a case where recognition of the special value of a particular chattel found expression not in the form of an enhanced award of damages, but through the grant of a court order for delivery up of the object. It is well established that a person whose chattel has been wrongfully taken or detained may, at the court's discretion, obtain an order for the return of the chattel, rather than for the mere payment of damages, where financial compensation alone would be an inadequate remedy. Such inadequacy may be apparent where the chattel is unique, irreplaceable, or integral to some ancient family tradition. A vivid early example is *Pusey v Pusey*<sup>25</sup> in 1684, where the court ordered specific redelivery of the ancient horn by which the Pusey estates were held.

Heirlooms are a particularly compelling illustration of the sort of chattel that is likely to attract specific relief. Other ancient cases

<sup>21</sup> As to cars see *Darbishire v Warran* [1963] 1 WLR 1067, distinguishing *O'Grady*. And see *Jennings v Wolfe* [1950] 3 DLR 442 (trophy bearskin); *Abbass v Hoyt's Moving and Storage Ltd* (1981) 47 NSR (2d) 648 (memorabilia).

<sup>22</sup> For an extreme case see *Miner v Canadian Pacific Railway Co* (1911) 18 WLR 476; Palmer and Hudson 'Damages for Distress', 884.

<sup>23</sup> *Farley v Skinner* [2001] UKHL 49, [2002] 2 AC 732.

<sup>24</sup> (1735) 3 P Wms 390.

<sup>25</sup> (1684) 1 Vern 273.

## Articles

involve successful claims for the return of family pictures<sup>26</sup> and a Roman altar.<sup>27</sup> There is, of course, every reason why the general principle should apply in similar manner to emotionally charged objects that were spoliated during the Holocaust, such as a painting given as a wedding present that counts as a 'childhood icon'.<sup>28</sup> Indeed the circumstances in which a Holocaust-related object became lost (such as murder, forced flight, or other persecution) may intensify the moral imperative that it shall be returned to the victim's family. If the Auschwitz suitcase had come into the possession of a private collector and Mr Levi-Leleu had established a valid legal claim, it seems unthinkable that a court would award him the mere economic value of the suitcase, in preference to an order for its return.

The thinking behind cases like *Somerset v Cookson* and *Pusey v Pusey* bears a family resemblance to a more recent decision on the equitable remedy of injunction.<sup>29</sup> In a recent dispute about the title to certain watches that once belonged to Sir Edmund Hillary, the children of his first wife (who had died in 1975) sought an injunction to restrain Sir Edmund's widow Lady Hillary from allowing them to be sold at auction. Lady Hillary had already consigned the watches to an auction house at Geneva and now argued that the balance of convenience favoured maintaining the status quo, allowing the sale to proceed, and granting the offspring damages in the event that title to the watches was ultimately shown to lie with them. An important strand in her defence was the presence of a term, in her contract with the auction house, that purported to oblige her to pay the auction house the commission that it would have earned (and its costs incurred to date) if the watches were withdrawn from sale. Having decided that the children had a strong arguable case for asserting title to the watches, Mr Justice Venning held that the injunction should lie. In his words:

<sup>26</sup> *Lady Arundell v Phipps* (1803) 13 Ves 95.

<sup>27</sup> *Somerset v Cookson* (1735) 3 P Wms 390.

<sup>28</sup> This term was applied to the von Kalckreuth painting *The Three Stages of Life* successfully claimed by Marietta and Ernest Granville while it was on loan to the Royal Academy from the Neue Pinakothek in Munich. See Norman Palmer, *Museums and the Holocaust* (Builth Wells: Institute of Art and Law, 2000), 19.

<sup>29</sup> *Hillary v Hillary* [2010] NZHC 1985 (12 Nov. 2010), HC Auckland.

### *Emblems and Heirlooms*

As to the balance of convenience, certainly at least in relation to the Everest watch and Peter's watch, both have an intrinsic value in themselves to the family of Sir Edmund, which cannot be addressed by money. Damages would not be an adequate remedy. Those factors support the issue of an injunction.<sup>30</sup>

### *Archives and Reinstatement*

Even a corporation may, it seems, have a uniquely personal interest in tangible property of a cultural or historic nature that it has diligently accumulated, catalogued, and archived over its lifetime. The dispute in *Aerospace Publishing Ltd v Thames Water Utilities Ltd*<sup>31</sup> was whether the proper redress available to the owner of an archive for the substantial destruction of the archive by flooding should take the form of a financial payment to represent the diminution in value of the archive or should rather consist of a sum of money to reflect the cost of reinstating the archive. Both in principle and in quantum these two measures of assessment were significantly disparate. Lord Justice Longmore<sup>32</sup> acknowledged that this collection of historically significant material was a distinctive creation, distinguishable both from a mere assemblage of commercial goods and from a single marketable item of high cultural and economic worth:

[T]he present case is not a case of a readily marketable asset, nor yet of a unique chattel like a rare manuscript, a Picasso painting or a Stradivarius violin. In the first sort of case little difficulty will arise; reinstatement will not usually be appropriate as it would not be reasonable to reinstate if an article can be bought in by the claimant at a lower cost. In the case of a unique chattel it may be reasonable to reinstate but it will not be too difficult, by reference to past auction prices, to assess realistically a market value even though the chattel is itself unique. It will then be easy to compare figures for reinstatement and market value.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid. at para 17. Cf. *Tudberry v Sutton* (1998) 20 Qld Lawyer Reports 13 at 21 per Judge McGill QC.

<sup>31</sup> [2007] EWCA Civ 3.

<sup>32</sup> At paras 50–2.

## Articles

Lord Justice Longmore then proceeded to explain the peculiar character of the archive and his sympathy for the arguments in favour of its reinstatement. In so doing he likened the archive to a human memory and described its construction as ‘a labour both of love and dedication’:

Plutarch . . . regarded the human memory as an archive. In a similar way the archive in the present case represents the companies’ memory and, as such, is an asset whose value could in conventional parlance be described as ‘priceless’ and whose actual value can only be calculated with considerable difficulty . . . It was a labour both of love and dedication to build up and then catalogue the archive in the first place . . . If the archive of a famous and long-established art dealer such as the Fine Art Society Ltd or an auctioneer such as Christie’s or Sotheby’s were destroyed, it would be mealy-mouthed in the extreme to confine recovery to the re-sale value of individual items.

### *Claims by Nation-States*

The philosophy of the family heirloom cases is, to some extent, matched by the modern judicial approach to claims by States for the return of looted national treasures, such as archives, art, and archaeological items. Here again the tendency is to favour an order for the return of a culturally outstanding object rather than damages. Where a foreign State can show that its domestic laws grant it a superior right of possession over undiscovered portable antiquities or other cultural objects unlawfully removed from its territory, the court will almost invariably grant to that State an order for specific restitution against the wrongful possessor. In two modern cases courts have appealed to the identity of the looted objects as ‘keys to the ancient history’ of the State to justify ordering their return.

In *Webb v Ireland and the Attorney General*<sup>33</sup> the outcome of such reasoning was to recognize that title to a hoard of valuable ninth-century ecclesiastical artefacts, found on land close to Derrynaflan Abbey, lay with the Republic of Ireland in preference to the finders,

<sup>33</sup> [1988] IR 353.

who were however rewarded for having declared the find. In *Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran v Barakat Galleries Ltd*<sup>34</sup> the question was whether certain provisions of Iranian law conferred on Iran the ownership of and the right of possession over antiquities that were allegedly buried on and illicitly excavated from Iranian territory. The Court replied in the affirmative. Citing the Chief Justice of Ireland in *Webb*, the Chief Justice Lord Phillips of Worth Matravers regarded it as 'universally accepted' that one of the most important national assets belonging to the people of a country consists of their heritage and of the objects that constitute 'the keys to their ancient history'; and that a necessary ingredient of sovereignty in a modern State was and should be the ownership by the State of discovered objects constituting antiquities of importance which had no known owner.

What may be true of nations may also be true of families and other communities or groups. They too may harbour a morally unanswerable need to possess the keys to their ancient history. While their entitlement may only rarely if ever be embodied in statutes, the moral demand that a family treasure be returned to that family may yet prove persuasive both within and beyond the courts. Victims of persecution whose loss has occurred through the gross violation of human rights, and for whom the contested object has a unique subjective value surpassing its mere economic worth and rendering it otherwise irreplaceable, might fairly expect an order for specific return rather than some monetary award.

*Sale of Goods Cases: The Decree of Specific Performance*

On occasions the commercial courts have dealt sensitively with the special interest that a collector may have in perfecting his or her acquisition of a distinctive object. Such cases involve no history of looting but a simple refusal to perform a contract. Sellers of cultural or historical objects sometimes change their minds between contract and delivery, forcing the disappointed buyer to seek redress at law. Whereas the normal remedy for a seller's failure to deliver, say, a washing machine or a cargo of salt will be a judgment for damages, the seller of a distinctive cultural object may be ordered to deliver the

<sup>34</sup> *Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran v Barakat Galleries Ltd* [2009] QB 22, [2007] EWCA Civ 1374.

## Articles

exact thing. The normal mechanism to achieve this will be a decree of specific performance, justified on the ground that (as with the cases of wrongful detention of heirlooms) damages are an inadequate remedy. A serious collector may well have a sufficiently personal interest in a chattel to qualify for such an order.

A modern case in point is *Smythe v Thomas*,<sup>35</sup> where the seller had agreed to sell to a private collector a 1944 Wirraway Australian Warbird aircraft. The seller later refused to deliver the plane and the buyer sued. One of the questions before the court was whether the seller should be allowed to keep the plane and merely compensate the buyer in damages, paying him the difference between the value of the plane and the price that the buyer had agreed to pay, or should hand over the plane itself. Acting Justice Rein rejected the argument that the seller should be liable only in damages, saying 'in my view the nature of the subject of the bargain, which is not only a fine looking aircraft . . . but is a vintage and unusual item, leads me to conclude that the case is one in which . . . the relief of specific performance of the contract sought should be granted.' This case may be contrasted with an English decision over eighty years earlier, where a dealer who had bought Hepplewhite chairs for resale in his business was held entitled to damages from his seller who refused to deliver them, but failed to persuade the court to grant him an order of specific performance. In this case damages were an adequate remedy.<sup>36</sup>

### *Holocaust-Related Objects*

#### *Is Money Ever a Sufficient Remedy?*

The choice between monetary compensation and specific restitution raises a potentially delicate question for bodies that are appointed to hear claims for the return of Holocaust-related objects. In England such a body exists in the form of the Spoliation Advisory Panel. The Panel is empowered to recommend either the return of an object or the payment of a monetary sum, whether by way of compensation or *ex gratia* payment. Normally payments are recommended on *ex gratia*

<sup>35</sup> [2007] NSWSC 844.

<sup>36</sup> *Cohen v Roche* [1927] 1 KB 169.

terms, on the reasoning that the term 'compensation' should be confined to payments in respect of surviving legal rights and no legal right survives on the facts in question. It is not impossible that the Panel might be urged to take account, in deciding whether to recommend the return of the object or an *ex gratia* payment, of the nature of the original owner's relationship with the chattel. As we have seen, at common law the remedy of specific delivery is generally confined to cases where the owner's predominant subjective interest in the chattel means that damages would be an inadequate remedy. Claims relating to a merchant's trading stock might generally be expected to attract an award of damages rather than the remedy of enforced redelivery. But suppose that the dispossession occurred through the operation of racially discriminatory laws in Germany at the height of the Nazi era. The ethical demand, that such atrocities be redressed, may not be adequately fulfilled by an award of money even though the victim had acquired the chattel only in order to sell it. The mere payment of money may fall short of achieving full justice, however liberal the sum and however impersonal the victim's connection with the chattel.

Not all of the public pronouncements acknowledging the subjective value of chattels are from common law countries such as England and Australia, and not all are decisions of courts. In a determination made by the Dutch Restitution Committee in 2009, the question was whether the Committee should apply the presumption, authorized by its terms of reference, that transactions by which Jewish people disposed of precious objects of a private nature during the Nazi occupation were flawed by Holocaust-related oppression. The claim concerned certain objects that had been the property of Carl Van Lier, an Amsterdam dealer, and had since the War variously found their way into the collections of the Netherlands Institute for Cultural Heritage and the National Museum of Ethnology at Leiden. The Committee concluded that most of the objects that departed from Van Lier's stock had not been disposed of involuntarily through theft, confiscation, or coercive dealing, or any direct threat thereof. But in the single case of a hunting horn made of elephant ivory, the Committee took a different view. There was evidence that Van Lier attached personal value to the object and that it belonged to his private collection as opposed to his trading stock. Among the clues to this effect was a photographic family portrait in which Van Lier was

## Articles

blowing the horn. This went to trigger the more lenient standards of proof applicable to private possessions and to justify the Committee's conclusion that Van Lier did not part with the horn willingly.

[T]he Committee feels that there is sufficient cause for another judgement with regard to one object, NK 396, an ivory hunting horn. In a family portrait of Van Lier from around 1930, he is blowing this horn. For the family, this photograph provides a salient image of their forefather and of an art object that was of unique value to him, thus giving the object an emotional value to the family.

### *Comparison Between the Dutch and the United Kingdom Spoliation Bodies*

The Van Lier claim illustrates several differences between the Dutch Holocaust claims experience and that of the UK. One is the absence from the regulating terms of the Spoliation Advisory Panel of any formal dichotomy between commercial possessions ('trading stock') and private possessions, and of any presumption that a disposal of privately owned objects during the Nazi era was involuntary. A further point of contrast perhaps is the relative value and commercial appeal of objects claimed within the two countries. While much of the cultural material claimed in the Netherlands has been of high value, claims have also been made for a significant number of relatively everyday objects. This is consistent with the level of original takings by the Nazis and their satellites: we are told that many Dutch people owned at least one good painting or item of furniture sufficiently attractive to the predators to be filched.<sup>37</sup> It is therefore unsurprising that such objects should now be the subjects of claims. In the United Kingdom, which was never occupied or ransacked, claims are likely to be limited to things stolen on the Continent and brought into the country after the War. Once again, the main targets of such importation are likely to have been the higher-value objects, many of which will have since found their way into museums.

<sup>37</sup> Palmer, *Museums and the Holocaust*, 2-3, n. 8.



*The Link Between Preservation and Value*

Not all Holocaust-related objects, then, are intrinsically ordinary. Many of the paintings and other chattels claimed by Holocaust survivors or their descendants have a pronounced cultural or historical significance. The past decade has witnessed a sharp rise in the number of such claims. At the beginning of the present century the Blair government responded by establishing the Spoliation Advisory Panel. The task of the Panel was to advise the government on claims against publicly funded museums by Holocaust survivors and their families.

It comes as no surprise that most of the claims brought before the Panel have been for cultural objects of high financial value. At the risk of generalization, such objects may have stood a better chance of surviving the war because preserving them would have been a priority. There is also a better chance that the provenance of such objects will have been recorded and that their original owner will be identifiable. Such objects are more likely to be worth the cost of investing in legal advice and action. Where the law allows special redress against museums, in the shape of the Spoliation Advisory Panel and the Holocaust (Return of Cultural Objects) Act 2009, the benefits of such redress are naturally confined to those who claim objects desirable enough to have been acquired by museums.

*The Spoliation Advisory Panel*

The Minister for the Arts established the Spoliation Advisory Panel in June 2000 to consider claims against publicly funded museums by those who lost possession of cultural objects between the years 1933 and 1945. The Panel is entrusted with evaluating the moral quality as well as the legal force of individual claims. Paragraph 7(e) of its Terms of Reference requires the Panel to 'give due weight to the moral strength of the claimant's case' while Paragraph 7(g) requires the Panel to 'consider whether any moral obligation rests on the institution'. In the latter regard, the Panel must take into account 'in particular' the circumstances in which the object was acquired by the institution, and the institution's knowledge at that juncture of the object's provenance. The phrase 'in particular' admits of considerations other than the circumstances of a museum's acquisition, includ-

## Articles

ing the basic proposition that the object was taken from the claimant without consent and in circumstances never since ratified. An innocent acquisition does not therefore necessarily denote a creditable retention. The institution may owe a moral obligation to return an object irrespective of any moral transgression on its part.

*A Survey of Claims before the Spoliation Advisory Panel*<sup>38</sup>

## Tate

The case of the painting *View of Hampton Court Palace* by Jan Griffier the Elder in the Tate Gallery, which was the subject of a report by the Panel in January 2001, is now well known. The children of a woman whose husband had been shot by the Nazis and who, in hiding from the Nazis in Belgium, was compelled to part with a treasured object in return for enough money to buy an apple and an egg, were awarded an *ex gratia* payment to reflect, with certain adjustments, the current market value of the work. This resolution was acceptable to the claimants and to the Tate Gallery, which was at that time debarred by law from disposing of Holocaust-related (and indeed other) objects vested in the Trustees as part of its collection. No less convenient to the Gallery was the Panel's further proposal that the payment be drawn from public funds and not from the Gallery's own resources. The award of money was supplemented by a recommendation that a commemorative notice be installed in the space adjacent to the painting, recalling the circumstances in which it was lost.

Among the significant features of the Griffier recommendation was the emphasis by the Panel on the public benefit derived from the Tate's forty-year possession of the work. This was regarded as relevant to two distinct questions: the identity of the payer of the *ex gratia* sum and the computation of the sum itself. On the first point, as we have seen, the Panel held that the payment should be made from general funds and not from the Tate's own resources. On the second

<sup>38</sup> In addition to the cases discussed below there are further reports from the Panel on claims involving the Courtauld Institute. See *Report of the Spoliation Advisory Panel on Eight Paintings in the Possession of the Samuel Courtauld Trust* (24 June 2009); *Report of the Spoliation Advisory Panel in respect of an Oil Sketch by Sir Peter Paul Rubens 'The Coronation of the Virgin', now in the Possession of the Samuel Courtauld Trust* (15 Dec. 2010).

point, the Panel held that the sum payable should include an amount for the past public enjoyment of the work in addition to its market value.

Between 2004 and 2009 the Panel reported on seven further claims for the restitution of objects in museums. In two of them – the Burrell and British Library claims – the Panel recommended the specific restitution of the work. Both recommendations were made despite the fact that a legal bar existed on the relinquishment of the work from the collection in which it resided. In the Burrell case the object was not eventually relinquished to the claimants while in the Benevento case it was.

#### Burrell

In 1936 a German Jewish family, who were shareholders in a prominent and reputable firm of art dealers, were subjected to a penal and discriminatory tax demand by a newly appointed tax inspector with Nazi sympathies. Being forced to sell their stock at very short notice, they consigned it to auction in Berlin. The sale arguably yielded normal market prices, but would never have occurred but for the victimization of the family. The receipts vanished immediately into the maw of the tax authorities. One senior member of the family, acutely distressed, had died of a stroke in a taxi after leaving an interview with the inspector. The rest of the family discharged the fictitious debt and fled to the United States.

One picture, thought at the time of the sale to be the work of Chardin but later discredited by Pierre Rosenberg, was knocked down to a dealer. The dealer re-sold it in Berlin shortly after the auction. The buyer was Sir William Burrell, the Scottish shipping magnate and a distinguished collector. Sir William took the work to Scotland and in 1944 he and Lady Burrell donated it, along with some eight thousand other works, to the Corporation of the City of Glasgow. The gift was made subject to an express prohibition (apparently contractual in nature) on any disposal from the collection. It denied to the donees any entitlement whatever to 'sell or donate or exchange' works from the collection.

The Panel noted the sizeable volume of works donated by Sir William and the difficult conditions under which the gift was executed. It exonerated the City of moral blame and accepted that the

## Articles

Jewish family's legal title was now defunct, but held that the moral argument for redress had been amply established. Notwithstanding Sir William's embargo on disposal, the Panel recommended the return of the work to surviving members of the family. It took the view that it was arguable that the prohibition on disposal should not apply to an act of restitution in circumstances such as these, and it recommended that the City take legal advice on this question.

Contrary to the Panel's expectation, the legal advice received by the City of Glasgow did not recognize any liberty in the City to dispose of the painting in the circumstances or on the grounds stated by the Panel. In the event the parties agreed on an *ex gratia* payment, and the work remained with the City.

## British Library

In 1946 a British army officer named Captain D. G. Ash offered to the British Museum a twelfth-century missal in Beneventan script. He said that he had bought it from a Naples bookseller while on active duty in 1944. In fact, the missal belonged to the Archdiocese of Benevento. It had been removed from Benevento in unidentified circumstances, not necessarily by Captain Ash. Dr Collins, the curator to whom the officer showed the missal, recommended that he investigate whether it was war loot. In 1947 the missal was offered for auction at Sotheby's in London and the Museum, having conducted no further independent investigation of its provenance, acquired it.

In a claim by the Archbishop, whose predecessor had first requested its return in 1978, the Panel concluded that on a balance of probabilities the missal was removed from the possession of the Archdiocese during or shortly after the hostilities that affected the region in 1944. It followed that the removal occurred within the time span (1933–45) stipulated in the Panel's terms of reference. The Panel further concluded that the Museum had paid insufficient regard to the prospect of unlawful removal when it acquired the work, and that the moral case for restitution was made out.

As with the Burrell claim, the Panel took the view that neither the admitted extinction of the Archdiocese's legal title by lapse of time, nor the existence of a legal bar to disposal (in this case, a statutory bar imposed by the British Library Act 1972) should inhibit it from recommending that the object be returned. The Panel proposed not only

(i) that the missal be returned, but also (ii) that the British Library Act 1972 be amended to make this possible, and (iii) that until such amendment was made the missal should be sent to Benevento on loan.<sup>39</sup>

Both the terms of the preliminary loan to Benevento, and the form of the required statutory amendment to the British Library Act 1972, continued to be debated over a long period after the Panel's report. In the event the Missal did not finally return to Benevento until early in 2011. Meanwhile the subtle and delicate political considerations that bear upon any prospective amendment of UK national museum statutes had led the British Museum in another case to explore an alternative route to achieve the power to renounce objects from its collection.<sup>40</sup> The occasion for this development was a claim for the restitution of four Old Master drawings bought by the Museum in 1946. The Gestapo had in 1939 seized the drawings from Dr Feldmann, a Jewish lawyer in Brno in Czechoslovakia, who was later murdered by the Nazis. The Chancery Division of the High Court, though sympathetic to the claim and to the Museum's desire to honour it, held that the provision on which the Museum relied (section 27 of the Charities Act 1993) did not grant to the Museum any overriding power of relinquishment, such as to enable the Museum to disregard the prohibitions on disposal in the British Museum Act 1963.

#### Ashmolean

In 2000 descendants of the deceased Jewish banker Jakob Goldschmidt laid claim to a work by Mair von Landshut, *Portrait of a Young Girl in a Bow Window*, now held by the Ashmolean Museum. Goldschmidt had owned the painting in Germany before the Second World War. The Ashmolean had accepted it as a bequest from the estate of William Spooner in 1967, knowing at the time that it had belonged to Goldschmidt between the wars.

The inter-war history of the work was one of the matters in dispute. Following the economic crisis of 1929, Goldschmidt had been

<sup>39</sup> It will be seen from this claim that both the historical sweep and the material scope of the Panel's jurisdiction are wide. The victim was a religious institution, there was no direct element of racial persecution, and it is at least as likely that the work was removed by Allied as by Axis forces.

<sup>40</sup> See below.

## Articles

obliged to commit many of his art objects towards the discharge of debts incurred on the collapse of the Danatbank, which he had founded. The relevant instruments of commitment were made first with the Danatbank itself and latterly with the Thyssen Iron and Steel Works. The Ashmolean contended that the von Landshut was among the committed works, and that its sale at auction in 1936, far from being an involuntary effect of Nazi policy and/or Goldschmidt's Jewish identity, followed from the agreement made by Goldschmidt in 1932 with the Thyssen organization, by which Thyssen were to manage Goldschmidt's debts. By the time of that sale, Goldschmidt himself had already (in 1933) departed for the USA.

The heirs alleged that Goldschmidt had continued to own the work until its sale in 1936, that it was not among the works secured towards the payment of his debts, that even if it was thus secured it had been secured only by a pledge, which did not transfer ownership to his creditors, that the sale of the object that was Goldschmidt's enduring property was a forced sale vitiated by material duress and/or the generally oppressive conditions afflicting Jews in Germany, and that those general conditions had prevented Goldschmidt from redeeming his financial position and discharging whatever debts (if any) the work had been sold to satisfy. On the strength of these assertions, the heirs argued that the proper moral outcome was the return of the work to them from the Ashmolean.

The Spoliation Advisory Panel rejected this analysis, holding in effect that the work was among those secured in favour of Goldschmidt's creditors, that the security executed by Goldschmidt gave to the creditors both ownership of the work and the right to sell it on default, that the sole occasion for the sale was the failure of Goldschmidt to discharge the secured debts by other means, and that both Goldschmidt's inability to redeem his finances and the consequent sale of the von Landshut were causally unconnected with and untainted by the generally oppressive conditions afflicting Jewish people in Germany over the period in question.

The Panel further held that the Ashmolean, having been aware on its acquisition that the work had once belonged to Goldschmidt, had reasonably and properly concluded that his cessation of ownership stemmed from general and personal financial crises. It followed that the Ashmolean could not be visited with any moral censure in respect of the manner of its acquisition, or indeed in respect of its

response to the claim: 'When the Painting was bequeathed to the Ashmolean in 1967 there was no reason to suspect that it could be the subject of a spoliation claim. It must also be remembered that the circumstances of the Danatbank's collapse and Goldschmidt's liabilities were internationally known and easy to reference. Thus it would have been natural to assume that the Painting had been sold in 1936 to meet Goldschmidt's debts.'<sup>41</sup> The Panel accordingly recommended that no action be taken in response to the claim.

#### The Rothberger Porcelain Claims: British Museum and Fitzwilliam Museum

On the application of the claimant, Mrs Bertha Gutmann of New Jersey, and with the consent of the museums concerned, the Panel considered jointly two separate claims concerning porcelain items. The first item was held in the collection of the British Museum, and the second in the collection of the Fitzwilliam Museum. Both items had allegedly been taken by the Gestapo in 1938 from the claimant's uncle, Heinrich Rothberger, in a seizure substantiated by authoritative historical research published in 2003 on Mr Rothberger's art collection. Neither Museum disputed the claimant's assertion of entitlement to the items. The claimant was able to produce for the Panel a series of wills of family members that established her sole entitlement to the objects.

*Identity of the British Museum item.* The British Museum Curator of Pre-History and Europe advised the Panel that she considered it very likely that the piece in the museum collection was the piece owned by the claimant's uncle. Her opinion was based, among other factors, on the description of the object in a publication of the time, the rarity of the object, and the fact that no others similar to it had been traced to date. It was, in her view, also unlikely that the piece would have been disposed of before the Gestapo seized the collection. The piece had been presented to the British Museum by a member of staff in 1939 and, though it was not known how he acquired it, the Museum accepted that he might have seen it in Vienna and known the Rothberger collection. Accepting the curator's reasons, the Panel accepted

<sup>41</sup> *Report of the Spoliation Advisory Panel in respect of a Painting held by the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford* (1 Mar. 2006), para 47.

## Articles

that the Museum piece was the piece formerly owned by Mr Rothberger.

*Identity of the Fitzwilliam item.* The Director of the Fitzwilliam Museum advised the Panel that a former director had bequeathed the item to the Museum in 1960. The former director had bought it prior to October 1948, when it was valued by Sotheby's valuation at his home in Cambridgeshire, and stated by Sotheby's to be from the Rothberger Collection. The exact circumstances in which the donor acquired the item were unknown. While inconsistencies in the references to the Rothberger item and the Fitzwilliam item in the 1938 sale catalogue meant that the two items could not conclusively be said to be one and the same, the Panel concluded that it was likely that the Fitzwilliam item, having regard to its size, form, decoration, label, and Sotheby's statement, had indeed belonged to Rothberger. The Panel therefore accepted that the museum piece was formerly the property of, and had been taken from, Heinrich Rothberger.

The Panel went on to conclude that both museums now had unchallengeable legal title to the porcelain in their possession. The foundation for this view was that any once-existent claim was now time-barred under the Limitation Act 1939. Further, in the Panel's view the museums had acquired the objects in good faith. The British Museum had exercised acceptable museum practices characteristic of the era, whereas the Fitzwilliam Museum, while perhaps under a heavier obligation by the 1960s to inquire into provenance, was under-resourced and could not therefore be criticized for the measures and practices that it exercised at that time. The Panel further observed that, whereas any relinquishment of the British Museum piece was prohibited under the British Museum Act 1963, no similar statute prevented the Fitzwilliam Museum from relinquishing the item in its possession.

Having concluded that there was no claim at law, the Panel went on to consider the moral position. It acknowledged that the moral basis for each claim was substantial. As to the British Museum item, the Panel acknowledged that the claimant would ideally have preferred specific restitution, as she had sought for the Fitzwilliam piece. In the circumstances, however, it accepted that the preferable solution was to recommend (i) an *ex gratia* payment reflecting the contemporary value of the item as appraised by independent valuers, combined with (ii) a public acknowledgement of the item's prove-



nance, and of the goodwill of the successor to Mr Rothberger, in any future display or publication of the item. The Panel took account of three independent capital valuations, and of the likely insurance costs had the items remained with the claimant's family, in reaching a recommended valuation of £18,000. It further recommended that such payment be made by the state from central funds and not by the Museum. This recommendation was considered to conform to the general advice of the Lord Chancellor, and to reflect a fair solution, given that the tax paying public will be able to continue to study the item and derive benefit from it. In relation to the Fitzwilliam item, the Panel concluded that, while the piece was of considerable importance to the Museum's collection, the moral demands of specific restitution outweighed this consideration and that specific restitution should be made.

*Some Observations on the Spoliation Advisory Committee Claims*

The Subjective Element

While all of the foregoing items had an objective money value, some at least would also have been personally meaningful, not only to the original owners but to their descendants and family. Many were privately collected by connoisseurs, who might be expected to cherish such things for their own sake. Many were taken in barbarous and discriminatory conditions that cried aloud for atonement. All those objects that had belonged to private persons recalled a past way of life that had been irreversibly mutilated. Such circumstances would have intensified the moral impulse towards restitution in cases where the loss was attributable to Nazification. But none of the claimants sought any independent financial redress for the personal anguish that they suffered in consequence of their being deprived of the objects. This may have been because there was no reprehensible conduct by the particular respondent,<sup>42</sup> though in principle that alone might not have been a barrier.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>42</sup> The one exception to this remark was the Benevento claim, and there the claimant was in effect (if not nominally) an institution.

<sup>43</sup> It will have been noted that the Panel is empowered to make money awards in place of the specific return of works. In the two cases where the Panel proposed a money award (Griffier/Tate and Rothberger/British Mu-

## Articles

### Power to Renounce

Statutory prohibitions on disposal have until recently dominated the claims brought against national museums. Apart from the Benevento missal and Fitzwilliam porcelain claims, there has been no single case in which return was recommended and return has actually yet taken place. In *Attorney-General v Trustees of the British Museum*,<sup>44</sup> the British Museum tried to avoid the need for legislative amendment by recruiting section 27 of the Charities Act 1993 to justify the return of works that the Museum felt morally obliged to return. The failure of this attempt left the route to restitution unresolved and intensified the demand for a clear source of authority by which national museums like the British Museum could relinquish Holocaust-related cultural objects when they considered the circumstances to justify the release. In due course the Government issued a consultation paper.<sup>45</sup> It was not, however, until four years after the *British Museum* case that the path was unblocked. This occurred through the enactment of the Holocaust (Return of Cultural Objects) Act 2009, examined below.

The claim in *Attorney-General v Trustees of the British Museum* involved four Old Master drawings taken by the Gestapo at Brno in March 1939 from the Czech lawyer and collector Dr Arthur Feldmann, who was imprisoned and subsequently murdered. All four drawings were later acquired by the British Museum: three by purchase and one by bequest. The Museum wished to return the drawings, contending that it had a moral obligation to do so. But its application on that ground to the Chancery Division of the High Court failed. The Vice-Chancellor held that the Charities Act could not be invoked to override the statutory prohibition on disposal.

The story did not end there. Following the decision of the High Court, the claimants moderated their claim to one for financial payment, and the parties jointly referred the claim to the Spoliation Advisory Panel, which upheld it. The drawings remained in the Mu-

seum), the claimants were willing to accede. It is a question whether the refusal of a claimant who is unwilling to accept money should conclude the matter and whether money can include a sum to represent distress. The Panel can also recommend commemorative and conciliatory action.

<sup>44</sup> [2005] EWHC 1089.

<sup>45</sup> *Restitution of Objects Spoliated in the Nazi Era: A Consultation Document* (July 2006).

seum, and Dr Feldmann's descendants received a recommended *ex gratia* sum of £175,000. This sum comprised a contemporary market valuation of £186,000 from which £11,000 was deducted to take account of potential insurance and sale costs that the claimants might reasonably have been expected to incur had they possessed the works and decided to sell them. The Panel further recommended that the sum be paid from central funds rather than by the British Museum.

Nor, as we have seen, did the story end with the settlement of the particular claim. Both the Feldmann case and that of the Benevento missal raised in sharp focus the inconvenience of those statutory fetters on disposal that inhibit a museum from adopting the morally imperative solution of relinquishing spoliated objects. The scope and content of legislative amendments designed to relax these fetters were in due course the subject of a consultation document published by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport.<sup>46</sup> At that time it was the apparent view of the DCMS that the statutory power of release recommended in the Benevento claim should be effected by separate and specific legislation, while the power to release objects in response to more 'mainstream' claims (such as Burrell or the British Museum) should be conferred by general legislation, but on terms circumscribed by some such phrase as 'in circumstances directly related to' or 'arising or resulting' from the actions of the Nazis, their collaborators or allies.<sup>47</sup> In fact, the outcome was a single piece of legislation, the Holocaust (Return of Cultural Objects) Act 2009.

*The New Statutory Power to Transfer Objects from Collections*

Summarized broadly, the Holocaust (Return of Cultural Objects) Act 2009 enables certain national institutions in the United Kingdom to release Holocaust-related objects from their collections, and to transfer those objects to claimants including Holocaust survivors or their descendants.<sup>48</sup> There had for some time been disquiet about the

<sup>46</sup> *Restitution of Objects Spoliated in the Nazi Era: A Consultation Document* (July 2006).

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.* paras 3.1 to 3.24.

<sup>48</sup> By section 4(2) the Act extends to England and Wales, and Scotland. The heading to section 2 of the Act reads 'Power to return victims' property'.

## Articles

British Museum's perceived inability to make restitution to the descendants of Dr Feldmann. In 2005, as we have observed, the Chancery Division of the High Court held that it was impermissible to override the constraints imposed by the British Museum Act by an appeal to section 27 of the Charities Act 1993.<sup>49</sup> It became clear to the government that new legislation was needed. As we have seen, a Consultation Paper seeking advice on the potential form of that legislation was published in 2006.<sup>50</sup>

The new legislation is tightly drawn, both in regard to the institutions covered,<sup>51</sup> and in regard to the material that might be relinquished. It is couched in discretionary terms and at no point mandates the return of any object. So much is plain from its long title, 'An Act to confer power to return certain cultural objects on grounds relating to events occurring during the Nazi era'. By section 2(1) of the Act, any institution to which the Act applies may transfer an object from its collections if two conditions are met. The first condition, imposed by section 2(2), is that the Advisory Panel has recommended the transfer. The second condition, imposed by section 2(3), is that the Secretary of State has approved the Advisory Panel's recommendation.<sup>52</sup> The foregoing power does not affect, and thus cannot enable an institution to override, any trust or condition subject to which any object is held. So much is stipulated by section 2(6), which resembles in this regard the equivalent provision in section 47(4) of the Human Tissue Act 2004.

<sup>49</sup> *Attorney-General v Trustees of the British Museum* [2005] EWHC 1089 (Ch).

<sup>50</sup> Above, n. 45.

<sup>51</sup> These are prescribed by section 1 of the Act, and include the Trustees of the British Museum, the Trustees of the Imperial War Museum, the Board of Trustees of the National Gallery, the Board of Trustees of the Wallace Collection, the Board of Trustees of the National Museums and Galleries on Merseyside, and the Board of Trustees of the National Museums of Scotland. This list is not exhaustive. By section 2(4) the Secretary of State may approve a recommendation for the transfer of an object from the collections of a Scottish body only with the consent of the Scottish Ministers. By section 2(5) 'Scottish body' means the Board of Trustees for the National Galleries of Scotland, the Trustees of the National Library of Scotland, and the Board of Trustees of the National Museums of Scotland.

<sup>52</sup> The power conferred by section 2(1) 'is an additional power': section 2(7).

By section 3(1), the term 'Advisory Panel' means for the purposes of the Act a panel for the time being designated by the Secretary of State for those purposes. The Secretary of State may designate a panel for the purposes of this Act only if the panel's functions consist of the consideration of claims which (a) are made in respect of objects, and (b) relate to events occurring during the Nazi era.

Aside from various provisions related to the coming into force of the Act,<sup>53</sup> the sole outstanding provision of the Act is the sunset clause contained in section 4(7). Under that provision, 'This Act expires at the end of the period of 10 years beginning with the day on which it is passed'.

The fact that the Act authorizes an institution to transfer an object from 'its' collections indicates with reasonable clarity that relinquishment is authorized only where the object has formerly become the property of that institution. On this analysis there is conversely no statutory authority to relinquish where the institution is merely in possession of the object and does not own it. It can hardly be supposed that the Act empowers an institution to dispose of an object that is not its own property. If, therefore, there is any realistic prospect that a Holocaust-related object remains the property of some person other than the institution, the statutory enablement may not apply and the institution would need to take further advice before relinquishing that object. Of course, if the owner of the object is the claimant now seeking its transfer there would seem to be no pre-existing bar on its release by the institution to that party, and the Act is unnecessary to achieve that: the institution would simply be returning the object to the party who has legal title. Moreover, there are many cases (probably the majority) where, however deplorable the original deprivation, the institution is in fact the current owner. So much is clear from the substantial number of cases before the Spoliation Advisory Panel where the Panel has concluded, or the parties have conceded, that the victim's original ownership is defunct.

<sup>53</sup> Section 4(3): 'The preceding sections of this Act come into force on such day as the Secretary of State may by order appoint.' By section 4(4): 'An order may make different provision for different purposes.' By section 4(5): 'Before appointing a day for the coming into force of the preceding sections of this Act so far as they relate to Scottish bodies the Secretary of State must consult the Scottish Ministers.' By section 4(6): ' "Scottish body" has the meaning given by section 2(5).'

## Articles

But in cases where there might exist other potential claimants, capable of asserting title, it might be imprudent of the institution to assume that it owns the object and that the Act itself justifies release to the immediate claimant. Such a situation might arise where family members are in disagreement (or have simply not been consulted) about the ownership and desired destination of the object.

## *Conclusion*

The enlarged ability of national museums to relinquish Holocaust-related objects, introduced by the Holocaust (Return of Cultural Objects) Act 2009, gives statutory recognition to the value of a claimant's personal association with such an object. It impliedly acknowledges that sometimes only the restitution of the object (as compared, for example, to a money payment) is an appropriate response to the claimant's sense of personal loss.

The fact that some Holocaust-related objects are of minor economic value but substantial personal importance nonetheless suggests a need to reappraise certain conventional attitudes to the management of claims. Of course, one cannot tell how many minor-value objects are extant and identifiable, and concern about such items may prove to be disproportionate to the power of public or private agencies to do anything about them, or indeed to the cost of such action if it were in theory viable. But to an extent it may be the very flaws of the existing treatment that make such identification so difficult. Despite the tremendous economies and other advantages extended to claimants by the existence of the Spoliation Advisory Panel the existing regime patently favours those who claim high-value objects. There are few if any instances of claims to items of intense subjective value and high sentimental worth, or indeed of low economic value. Aside from the Rothberger porcelain award of £18,000 (for a single item) the lowest-value claim appears to have been for the Burrell-donated painting *Pâté de Jambon* valued by the Panel at £7,500. This valuation was reached only after the attribution of the work to Chardin had been discredited. While family emblematic status has occasionally been attributed to work claimed outside the Spoliation Panel (for example the von Kalckreuth 'childhood icon') the conscious ascription of such status remains rare. One looks in vain for

assertions of such status (and for claims for money payments to reflect personal distress at deprivation) in submissions before the Spoliation Advisory Panel. No doubt this is in part because a claim can be brought before the Panel only where the institution is in possession of the claimed work, and in those circumstances claimants are likely to demand the physical redelivery of the work itself. But there seems no reason in principle why a claim for compensation or an *ex gratia* payment to relieve personal distress might not be combined with a claim for specific restitution, or indeed advanced as an alternative.

This atmosphere of disadvantage to the small-scale victim may be reflected in other corners of our legal system. For example, there is an ingrained and justified judicial dislike of litigation that costs more than the value of its subject matter. A sense of proportion in such matters is part of the overriding principle that courts must do justice between the parties. A successful claimant might therefore fail to recover costs from the losing party where the matter at hand could reasonably and more economically have been referred to alternative dispute resolution. A typical expression of this view can be found in the judgment of Lord Justice Ward in *Tavoulares v Lau*,<sup>54</sup> where the warring parties had collectively expended £85,000 on a dispute over art works that were valued at a maximum of £23,500. Lord Justice Ward said:

This litigation fills me with despair . . . litigation must be fun if the parties are prepared to spend that much on a rollercoaster ride to judgment without pausing, either of them, to suggest that mediation would be a more sensible way to resolve their differences . . . I would have thought that there are very easy ways through mediation and a bit of common sense to resolve this matter and hopefully to resolve it quickly and without a further extraordinary waste of money.

Here again, however, one must beware of reducing this area of restitution to a simple matter of economics. While no litigant should be encouraged to take prodigal action in pursuing a claim for restitution, it seems fair to suggest that certain Holocaust-related objects are

<sup>54</sup> [2007] EWCA Civ 474.

## Articles

so heavily charged with legitimate personal concerns, peculiar to the individual and divorced from their economic value, that it could be reasonable to pursue them through court action, even though the cost of such action exceeds their economic worth. A similar argument might be made about claims by indigenous peoples to recover ancestral remains or other relics having spiritual force. In many cases court action may be the only way to compel a museum or private possessor to pay serious attention to a claim. Indeed there is one instance where an English national museum has agreed to mediation only after being taken to court.<sup>55</sup> It would be unfortunate if the low economic value of the material claimed were to be invoked as a ground for denying costs to the successful claimant.

The emotional bond between a Holocaust victim and a chattel might suggest that an element of personal hurt could figure in a claim for damages based on the loss or destruction of the object. It is notable that almost every Holocaust-related claim in England has related to an existing chattel of which the claimant has (at least initially) sought specific restitution. There has been no claim for either compensation or an *ex gratia* payment based on the wrongful taking or violation of a chattel that no longer exists. Should such a claim arise, there is no reason in principle why it should not lead to redress founded in part on the claimant's subjective anguish. And if such redress could be awarded where the chattel is destroyed or irretrievably lost, it might also be awarded where the chattel continues to exist but is no longer in the possession of the particular defendant.<sup>56</sup> Such an award might occur where a museum knowingly returns a borrowed work to its lender in open defiance of a legitimate third party claim by a Holocaust survivor. The museum is liable to the third party in the tort of conversion,<sup>57</sup> but there can of course be no question of specific restitution. Payments might extend both to the market value of the chattel and the emotional suffering inflicted on

<sup>55</sup> *Tasmanian Aboriginal Centre v Natural History Museum* (2007).

<sup>56</sup> Such a claim could not be brought before the Spoliation Advisory Panel because the Panel's jurisdiction extends only to cultural objects 'now in the possession of a UK national collection or in the possession of another UK museum or gallery established for the public benefit'. *Spoliation Advisory Panel, Constitution and Terms of Reference* (Revised, June 2000) para 3 (emphasis added).

<sup>57</sup> *Marcq v Christie Manson & Woods Ltd* [2004] QB 286.



the true owner in consequence of the chattel's being irretrievably lost. A similar result might be justified where the chattel has passed through the hands of successive buyers and re-sellers, all of whom have committed conversion but none of whom has the current possession of the chattel.

Some of these ideas may appear fanciful. To the extent that they relate to proceedings in court, they also turn on the precarious premise that the claimant retains the title to sue. In many instances that will not be true because the limitation period will have expired. It may be that in time a court will find ways of mitigating the effect of time bars on Holocaust-related claims, though that prospect is uncertain. Such matters aside, it would seem fair to take account of the power of personal association in the structuring and resolving of Holocaust claims.

It was Mr Bernstein in *Citizen Kane* who reminded us of the fortuitous nature of memory. Recalling a girl on the Jersey ferry, whom he had glimpsed for only a second some forty years earlier, he said that not a month had passed when he did not think of her.

A fellow will remember a lot of things you wouldn't think he'd remember. You take me. One day, back in 1896, I was crossing over to Jersey on the ferry. And as we pulled out, there was another ferry pulling in, and on it there was a girl waiting to get off. A white dress she had on. She was carrying a white parasol. I only saw her for one second. She didn't see me at all. But I'll bet a month hasn't gone by since that I haven't thought of that girl.<sup>58</sup>

We do not always appreciate, at the time they occur, those experiences that will live in our thoughts. Nor can we foresee the memories that will last for as long as we live. Where so much of a person's past has vanished through conflict or extermination, the simple things which echo that past should be treated as precious, and graced by formal recognition. Law and government should share in that recognition.

<sup>58</sup> The speech was delivered by the great actor Everett Sloane, playing Bernstein. Mere reproduction of the text cannot do justice to the delivery.

## Articles

NORMAN PALMER QC (Hon) CBE FSA is a barrister specializing in the cross-border restitution and lending of cultural objects. He is a member of the Spoliation Advisory Panel and from 2001 to 2011 chaired the Treasure Valuation Committee. He has acted as adviser and advocate in many law cases involving looted objects of art and antiquity, including the landmark decision of the English Court of Appeal in *Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran v Barakat Galleries Ltd* in 2007. His law practice includes writing loan and exhibition agreements for leading museums and advising governments on the drafting of laws relating to national cultural heritage. He is the Emeritus Professor of the Law of Art and Cultural Property at UCL and a Visiting Professor of Law at King's College London.

**DIASPORIC HOME OR HOMELESSNESS:  
THE MUSEUM AND THE CIRCLE  
OF LOST AND FOUND**

HANNO LOEWY

Curatorial practice in Jewish museums has to deal with objects of ambiguous or doubtful provenance. This article is not concerned with the great scandals of looted art on which the public debate repeatedly focuses, with restitution politics, or the fairground of the Judaica market and the passion and greed of collectors. There are others to tell the stories of those known or unknown pieces of art and their journey from the homes of their former Jewish owners to the headlines of today. In this article, I would like to reflect instead upon the context of material memory, the trajectory of meanings, emotions, and affections attached to objects of everyday life—artefacts that mostly have no financial value but sometimes possess a charged, multi-layered, emotional significance. For those of us working in museums and displaying material culture in a discourse called ‘exhibition’ that engages our visitors at all levels of cognition and emotion, this ambiguous significance is a particular challenge. It is the source of the museum’s strength compared to other cultural agencies and it is its subject, because these stories and trajectories are the very issue of any critical evaluation of material culture. They are the abyss of the curators’ morale because whatever we do is an appropriation of our own narrative strategies that are only possible because of the misappropriation of these objects from their original context, that is, the life of their owners. And with regard to the specific subject of our work, this is also a story of violence. The examples that will be discussed in the following attempt to express these challenges, at least implicitly, while leaving the subject for readers to reflect upon themselves.

To begin with, the context of the museum as a social space will be addressed, in particular, cultural and social history museums of which Jewish museums tend to be articulate and emblematic representatives. The second part of this article will concentrate on a number of mini case studies, in which a few categories of objects that curators have to deal with will be developed. I will conclude by exploring some examples of curatorial practice, both in the Hohen-

## Articles

ems museum and in others that confront similar issues concerning contentious objects.

### *I The Museum as a Social Space*

The museum, and especially the cultural and social history museum, is a particular kind of social space that includes not only exhibitions and collections, but also a complex set of social rituals, such as the welcome and farewell at the counter, and of spatial hotspots, where visitors interact and communicate with each other and with the museum's staff. It includes the shop and the cafeteria, both locations of physical consumption and pleasure, of communication and business, and the creation of new memorabilia that the visitor takes out of the institution. As soon as visitors enter the exhibition space they step into a specific environment that differs from that in which other forms of contemplative art and artistic narrative, such as music or film, theatre or literature, are consumed. It finds spectators and readers (in most exhibitions except for traditional art exhibitions visitors are both) not in a state of day-dreaming or hypnosis but as alert and awake as possible. The experience of visitors is all about decision-making: they decide how they will move through space, the angle from which they will observe what is offered, and how they will comment on it, communicating with other visitors, both those in their company and complete strangers. The mode of the exhibition, either expressly articulated or merely in its material substance, thus constantly creates ambiguity that could also be termed a kind of liminality in real and virtual space. Some of these ambiguities will be explored in the article that follows.

#### *The Ambiguity of the Sacred and the Profane*

The museum makes objects that were produced to be used in the context of cult and religious practice profane by presenting them in the secular context of a historical narrative or aesthetic experience. With the secularization of monasteries and churches that started in the eighteenth century, religious artefacts and works of art that had served the narrative of Christianity in the context of worship and ritual were taken into civil custody, and were turned into either 'cul-

tural heritage' or representations of the idea of artistic genius. At the same time, this profanation of the sacred was part of the creation of a new myth, the myth of the nation. And while works of ritual art became part of cultural heritage, the same process endowed the most profane objects of everyday life with the sacred aura of national culture, which in itself represented a mythification. Beginning with institutions like the Louvre in Paris as a result of the French Revolution in 1793,<sup>1</sup> the nineteenth-century museum became a kind of secular temple of the new myth of national culture and local folklore.<sup>2</sup> This development reached the fabric of Jewish identity-making with some delay around 1900.

*The Ambiguity of Past and Presence*

The museum exploits the aura of the 'original', that is, the physical presence of a past time. It plays on the fact that the physical continuity of the objects it exhibits bridges the gap of chronological time. Visitors are able to touch, or at least view, the physical substance of the past, an object that was touched in the same way (at least, that is the illusion they often enjoy) by those before them. Simultaneously, however, the museum alienates the objects from their own timeframe by transferring them into a contemporary setting of mixed media installations and display cases, transforming them into relics of a vanished life and turning them into something they had never been.

*The Ambiguity of Master Narrative and Counter Narrative*

The museum presents the objects in an order that follows a narrative which the museum, that is, its team of curators, creates. As curators we tell stories, our exhibitions follow storylines, and we always send

<sup>1</sup> For the history of the Louvre with regard to the process of secularization see Gottfried Fliedl (ed.), *Die Erfindung des Museums: Anfänge der bürgerlichen Museums-idee in der Französischen Revolution* (Vienna, 1996); id., 'Die Pyramide des Louvre: Welt als Museum', in Moritz Csáky and Peter Stachel (eds.), *Die Verortung von Gedächtnis* (Vienna, 2001), 303–33, at 306–7.

<sup>2</sup> Aleida Assmann, *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses* (Munich, 1999), 133 ff. On the museum as a space for rituals of initiation for the citizens of the new civil society see Carol Duncan, *Civilizing Rituals Inside Public Art Museums* (London, 1990).

## Articles

visitors on a path that we have already laid out with our ideas. We read the exhibition like a text, following a linear order. But that is not what visitors actually do. They have learned to make up their own stories, implementing their own readings, observations, and expectations into the process. They do not always follow the order prescribed by the curators, but decide on their own moves within the exhibition space, based on many different factors that curators can never control completely, such as the sheer attraction of different objects and their subjective hierarchy in the eyes of visitors, the way in which visitors move and the potential of communicating with them (whether they are part of a group, a family, a couple, or are unrelated). And what we learn from them is that this is a creative process.

### *The Ambiguity between Biography and History*

The objects that invite this contemplation on the part of visitors and inspire communication are attached to a particular biography. They are part of the way in which individuals interpret themselves, want to be seen, and want to be identified with. They are metaphors for belonging and separation. In short, they represent an attempt to construct identities, the material imprint of the self-imagination of other individuals (mostly long since passed away), examined by visitors to the museum. As exhibits, these objects are, in one way or another, taken away, taken out of context by the course of history, with or without consent, willingly or by force, transferred from being part of individual life into the realm of the collective creation of meaning. They are part of a process of dispossession that makes museums a matter of power, a contested territory.

For Jewish museums these ambiguities are especially challenging and sometimes productive. There is probably no institution that makes more sense of the term 'Jewish space'. Jewish museums represent a space that is not defined by Jewish tradition or a particular Jewish audience, but constitutes an arena of discourse about 'Jewish questions' conducted by Jews and non-Jews alike, a discourse that constitutes the 'Diaspora'.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>3</sup> For discussion of the concept of 'Jewish space' see Diana Pinto, 'The Jewish Space in Europe', in Sandra H. Lustig and Ian Leveson (eds.), *Turning the Kaleidoscope: Perspectives on European Jewry* (Oxford, 2006), 179–86.

Jewish museums came into being around 1900, reflecting the ongoing process of the transformation of Judaism from a traditional religious way of life into predominantly a question of identity that was connected with several contradictory factors, such as cultural expressions, family traditions and bonds, national reconstruction, and even utopian political dreams.<sup>4</sup> In the middle of this process of dissolving the fabric of traditional communities around the synagogues, beginning with rural communities, an urgent need emerged to find a new home for homeless objects and a site for the transformation of ritual objects into the subject of new rituals connected with the cultural temple of the museum. Unlike the kinds of national identity projects nineteenth-century cultural museums served all over Europe, the early Jewish museums in Vienna (1895), New York (1904), Prague (1906), Budapest (1909), Worms (1912), Berlin (1917), Frankfurt am Main (1922), Breslau (1927), and London (1932),<sup>5</sup> to name only a few, created a kind of discourse that aimed to save a particular tradition as a universal cultural heritage in order to make it part of the process of assimilating and integrating Jews into their new 'homelands'.<sup>6</sup> This was definitely not possible without creating a certain ambivalence between acculturation and nostalgia for a certain 'otherness', represented by the cultural artefacts.

Fifty years later, the same objects, so far as they still existed, seemed to be homeless in a much more radical way than the first founders of Jewish Museums (whether in Vienna, Vilnius, or New York) ever anticipated. With the unprecedented violence towards and extermination of European Jewry in the Shoah it was almost forgotten that

<sup>4</sup> For discussion of the creation of Jewish museums around 1900 and later, see Felicitas Heimann-Jelinek and Wiebke Krohn, *Das erste Jüdische Museum* (Vienna, 2005); Felicitas Heimann-Jelinek (ed.), *Was übrig blieb: Das Museum jüdischer Altertümer in Frankfurt, 1922–1938* (Frankfurt am Main, 1988); ead., 'Eine Sammlung in Wien', in ead. (ed.), *Möcht' ich ein Österreicher sein: Judaica aus der Sammlung Eisenberger* (Vienna, 2000); Dirk Rupnow, *Täter – Gedächtnis – Opfer: Das 'Jüdische Zentralmuseum' in Prag 1942–1945* (Vienna, 2000).

<sup>5</sup> Jens Hoppe, *Jüdische Geschichte und Kultur in Museen: Zur nichtjüdischen Museologie des Jüdischen in Deutschland* (Münster, 2002), 261 ff.

<sup>6</sup> This is emphasized for Vienna's Jewish Museum by Klaus Hödl, 'Jüdische Identität und Museum: Das Wiener jüdische Museum im 19. Jahrhundert', *transversal: Zeitschrift des Centrums für Jüdische Studien*, 3/1 (2002), special issue: *Sammeln und Präsentieren: Konzeptionen des Jüdischen*, 47–67.

## Articles

the traditional world we now seek to remember by contemplating its material heritage had already begun to change and dissolve long before. The Nazis did not only carry out exterminations; they also had their own ideas about preservation. They even created their own memory of the destruction of Jewish life in museums that celebrated the dispossession of Jewish material culture and its meaning as a triumph of the new 'chosen people' (the Germans), turning their obsession with Jews (that went far beyond anti-Semitism) into an obsession with collecting any trace of Jewish 'spiritual power'. The Nazis themselves thus created a highly ambiguous resource for any strategy of reappropriating this material culture after 1945.<sup>7</sup>

After the Shoah even the most minuscule trace of physical existence became precious and 'sacred' in the realms of another teleological perspective on history. Zionism, like other ideologies that dreamed of a historical turning point, aimed to put an end to diasporic Jewish history as we know it. From this perspective, the fragments of Jewish material life that survived the Shoah became relics of martyrdom, as a sacrifice of life meant the absolute end of the old Jewish world and the creation of a new one.

But the question once so rigidly answered by the most secular Zionist utopians only became more apparent: would Judaism as a religion be a matter of the past and the 'Sherit Hapleitah', the survivors in displaced persons camps, be magically transformed into the 'First of the First', the human resource on which the revival of a Jewish Nation in Israel would draw? Or would the 'Jewish state' take Judaism back to its own pagan roots by stepping behind the diasporic tradition of the prophets and resurrecting the old religion of the Temple? Or would the Jewish Diaspora finally re-emerge on the surface, with the museum as a kind of transitional field of preservation, experiment, and open discourse?

### *II Object, Trajectory, and Emotion: Case Studies*

The four case studies that will be discussed here illustrate the variety of ambiguous trajectories that curators come across in their work. All

<sup>7</sup> Dirk Rupnow, *Vernichten und Erinnern: Spuren nationalsozialistischer Gedächtnispolitik* (Göttingen, 2005). For the impact of this 'heritage' see also id., *Aporien des Gedenkens: Reflexionen über 'Holocaust' und Erinnerung* (Freiburg, 2006).



but the first are taken from curatorial practice in Hohenems, a little town on the Austrian–Swiss border, south of Lake Constance. For three centuries, beginning in 1617, a Jewish community lived there. Hohenems was once an imperial county and not part of Austria, making it the oldest continuously existing Jewish community inside Austria’s present-day borders. In the nineteenth century, about 600 Jews lived there, forming the centre of a network of Jewish marriage and business migration between southern Germany, Switzerland, Austria, and Italy. From there the incentive came to form Jewish communities in St Gallen, Innsbruck, and Merano. And for thirty years, from 1849 to 1878, the Jews in Hohenems formed their own political community, with their own mayor, in a market town with a growing textile industry, owned by Jewish entrepreneurs, and two main streets, Jews Lane and Christians Lane (probably the only street with that name in Europe).

From the end of the eighteenth century Jewish families from Hohenems migrated all over western Europe, to the USA and Turkey, and later to South America, Australia, and Palestine. After full legislative emancipation in Austria, Germany, and Switzerland in the 1860s, most of Hohenems’s Jewish families left for St Gallen, Zurich, Trieste, Merano, Vienna, Munich, Frankfurt, London, Florence, Rome, or Brussels. By 1938 there were just fifteen Jews left in the town. Long before the destruction of the community and the deportation of the last eight members still living in Hohenems in 1940, the Jews of Hohenems had created what is today still called, with some irony, the ‘Hohenems Diaspora’. In the 1970s gentiles in Hohenems, now a local community without Jews, started to entertain the idea of giving the memory of the once thriving Jewish community a home. There were, of course, very different motives for this initiative. From those who wanted to show the world that everything was better in Hohenems to those who had enough evidence for disillusionment, grounded in the obvious existence of anti-Semitism among the locals, from gentiles who longed for reconciliation to the descendants of Jewish families who wanted to reconnect with their past, a multilayered coalition brought a museum into being in 1991. Now this institution serves as a custodian or trustee of diverse and contradictory memories, stories, and artefacts that relate to Hohenems but clearly do not ‘belong’ there, constructed and contested narratives and artefacts that the museum does not possess but takes care of.

## Articles

a) Our first case study concerns not museums but everyday life, not only property and restitution, real estate, art, and bank accounts, but the little artefacts that we often do not pay attention to at all—a heritage also present in many regular ‘German families’. These stories are about how we create meaning, belonging, and identities. A friend who worked as a psychodrama therapist once described vividly how he made people re-enact their relationships with their family members, relatives, friends, and others by reflecting on objects in their immediate environment, and making these objects ‘speak’. A client of his was suffering from a serious inability to concentrate on her work. While she was exploring these problems another anxiety that occupied her came to the fore: she felt the danger that she might convey these paralysing feelings of being blocked and stunned to her daughter. While focusing on her environment during the psychodrama process, a little box on her desk appeared in her story. She related that she kept a gold ring in the box, one that she had received as gift from her mother and a strong symbol of family tradition. While working on that story, the client realized that she should know more about this ring. In the end—and the story is so emblematic that recounting it becomes almost kitschy—she knew more about her family and guessed much more that she did not know and that her therapist was unable to help her with. Only research in the archives allowed her to discover more. She found out that the ring was a present to her mother from her father, who had been abroad around 1942, working in the German Ghetto Administration somewhere in the Baltic provinces. The gold ring was a symbol of the new well-being of the couple—both from lower-class families—and of their own family that they had started just before the war. For my friend’s client, the gold ring at first appeared to be merely a kind of memento of her mother, something that she would naturally pass on to her own daughter at some point.

What would happen if she decided to interrupt this material trajectory of complicity? She could sell the ring on the market to get rid of the physical memory and to transform it into the universal and innocent currency of money, something that would help her to let the memory vanish into the realm of pure ideas, into something without any physical substance, not something to be passed on as a symbolic gift. Or she could ‘return’ the ring by handing it over to an agency of material restitution (for example, the Claims Conference or the

Stiftung Zurückgeben), knowing that those who would profit from this gesture would probably not be the original owners or their heirs, but members of some sort of Jewish collective body, whose definition depended on its political agenda. Or thirdly, she could make the story itself part of a public act of compensation and give it to an institution like a museum, leaving it to them, that is, to 'us', to deal with. Or she could decide to pass it on to her daughter after all, now with the full weight of the fragments of historical knowledge she had acquired, creating a different kind of complicity that left the decision of how to make use of that knowledge to her children. I never heard how the story of the ring ended, whatever the 'end' of this story could be, and how its owner finally decided to settle her relationship with it.

There are, no doubt, literally thousands of objects like this around. In the files of any Ghetto or Camp Administration hundreds of official requests for rings, watches, necklaces, or whatever can be found, mostly from German policemen, soldiers, and civil servants, explicitly asking for Jewish property, to name only one of the careers of such items. Some of these objects found their way into museums, others remained in the everyday use of their subsequent owners, however they might have come into their possession.

b) The second case study is even more complex, because it is not about loot but about lost and rediscovered identities, a trajectory of objects that makes them a kind of Marrano, Jews who hide their heritage and pass as 'non-Jews'. In 2006 I met an old woman in Brussels, whose grandmother had been the last owner of one of the industrialists' mansions in the former Jewish quarter of Hohenems, coincidentally, the mansion that now houses the town's Jewish Museum. The story concerns several taboos that are carefully shared and passed on from generation to generation. It is also the story of a particularly attractive artefact, at least from the perspective of an exhibition curator. When this woman was still a child living in Belgium, she visited her grandmother in Hohenems, who lived in the old, gloomy mansion with its garden. Her grandmother had inherited the mansion from her parents. She had married in Antwerp, and returned to Hohenems in 1906, when her husband, a failed businessman and gambler, lost his money and committed suicide. Their son had finished boarding school and entered military service in Belgium, married his non-Jewish girlfriend, and become the father of a little girl. In

## Articles

1936, when his mother had to pay off his gambling debts too, in order to prevent worse, she sold the mansion to a gentile physician in Hohenems and moved into a smaller apartment inside the same house. The aura of loss had thus been in the air before the Nazis took her to Vienna and then to Theresienstadt, her last journey.

For her granddaughter, the fascination of life in the villa as a child was summed up in a music box, resembling a large gramophone. When I met her in 2006, I was similarly fascinated with this masterpiece of home entertainment on display in her living room. A record on the turntable was waiting to perform 'Wiener Blut'. When she, and her father visited Hohenems again in about 1948, knowing that her grandmother would never return, they were given her grandmother's belongings, including the music box, which the gentile physician and his family had kept for her or her family throughout the war. But this trajectory of the objects is only one part of the story.

The woman I met was raised as a Christian, just as her children were raised as Christians. The Jewish part of the family that ended in the Holocaust is mixed with the bad luck of men who gambled and lost. Both the family's Jewish history and the memory of the bad luck of its men are passed over as a taboo. Nobody in the family talks about their Jewish heritage, yet everybody probably knows about it (as something not to mention). She carefully explained to us how ambivalent, even negative, she felt about the fact that the gloomy mansion of her childhood had become a museum and a public space, a place where the memory of her family (for fifty years the most successful Jewish family in Hohenems) had become a public issue. Yet when asked for an interview for a media installation in the museum, she told the whole story of her family, openly and at length, unhesitatingly accepting that the video would be used in public for the exhibition. But as a curator asking to borrow the music box for the exhibition, I ran up against a wall. The music box still had a life to live and a task to fulfil; it had to transfer the ambiguous tune of 'Wiener Blut' from generation to generation. The time to begin a new life in the museum had not yet come for this music box.

c) The third case is more humorous, even if it is humour on the edge of an abyss. Just a few months ago the son of the last cantor of Hohenems, Harry Weil jun. from Albuquerque, New Mexico, sent us a box in which we found his father's last *Lederhosen* (leather trousers)

*Diasporic Home or Homelessness*

(see Ill. 1). Harry Weil sen. was apparently quite a character. A passionate mountaineer who made his living selling insurance, he served his Jewish community as a cantor when the Hohenems community was already too small to host a regular service and was about to dissolve in the 1920s and 1930s. Weil founded workers' choirs and swing bands in the Vorarlberg region, married a Catholic, became a Communist and then a Trotskyite, fled to Switzerland in 1938 while his brother was killed in Dachau, and emigrated to Chicago in 1939. After the war he fought in vain for restitution as the Hohenems municipality considered that he had 'voluntarily' gone to Switzerland. Weil started a business importing Austrian cheese to the USA, which allowed him to stay in touch with the friends he still had in Hohenems and Vorarlberg. He returned there on a number of occasions on *Heimatreisen* (home journeys) and, finally, in 1970 for his funeral at the Jewish cemetery of Hohenems. To complete this complex image, he returned in an urn, although in principle cremation is strictly prohibited for Jews. Nothing is taboo in this family, but their stories are too numerous to be told here. In the meantime, Harry Weil jun. has received a ring of honour from the Hohenems municipality, awarded in a humble, somewhat inappropriate, but heartfelt cere-



Illustration 1. *Lederhosen*. By courtesy of Jewish Museum Hohenems.

## Articles

mony. He returned to his family on the ranch in Albuquerque, only to stop by for a beer or two the following year.

So for this family, as for others, passing an object on to the museum is part of a controversial and ironic discourse of living a self-conscious diasporic life, using the museum as a kind of ironic focus of their own 'Hohenems Diaspora', as they put it, a Diaspora that functions through an osmotic family network, creating meaningful history with a twist, or rather, many twists. This, paradoxically, corresponds to a growing awareness of the way in which local people in Hohenems treat *their* memories of the Jewish presence. Harry Weil sen.'s *Lederhosen* found their way into our permanent display, along with the watch that Harry Weil kept after the First World War, engraved in memory of his service as a Tyrolean *Kaiserjäger*, fighting for Austria in the Dolomites.

d) The fourth object—two small brass stars, two centimetres wide—is the least spectacular and is also connected to the story of Harry Weil jun. in a way (see Ill. 2). In 2010, while working on an exhibition project entitled 'A Certain Jewish Something', we sent letters to local people and friends abroad, asking for 'their' Jewish 'something'. Without explaining who we were reaching out to in par-



Illustration 2. Brass stars. By courtesy of Jewish Museum Hohenems.

ticular, Jews and non-Jews alike, or what exactly we meant by 'a certain Jewish something', we asked people to go to Hohenems on a certain day in October 2010 and bring along the artefact of their choice and a text telling its story. They would be photographed with it, we explained, and recorded for a radio programme. Parts of this particular exhibition format, developed by Swiss writer and journalist Katarina Holländer, had already been successfully realized in Zurich, Augsburg, Frankfurt, and Munich, when we sent out our call. Many brought along their 'Jewish something' on that date. All the objects and their owners came from Hohenems itself, from the region between Zurich and Innsbruck, but also from as far afield as Rotterdam, Hamburg, Prague, and Frankfurt.

Horst, a man from Hohenems, brought along the little stars and their story. As a child (and a friend of the young Harry Weil jun.), he used to play around the old synagogue while living in the Rabbi's house (under the same roof as the Weil family until 1938), when the synagogue was looted by the Nazis. Everything inside vanished at that time. Ritual objects were melted down 'for the war effort', the Tora scrolls were taken away, the textiles destroyed, the furniture and decorations thrown out into the streets. The stars that Horst took away before they went missing were the only remnant of what had been inside the synagogue. For him they were two small stars (five points, not to be misunderstood), a small innocent piece of loot, a memento for himself. He kept them for a long time as a talisman, a lucky charm, and a memory of the world he had marvelled at when he was 6 years old. He kept the stars even when, much later, he became a member of the Board of the Jewish Museum. He never told anyone. The meaning of these objects definitely changed for him over time. What did they mean to him over the last twenty years, when the museum was in existence? Did he hesitate to give them back because he was shy about having 'robbed' them? Did he hesitate because he felt that he wanted to control his story himself and not pass it on into other hands?

### *III The Hidden Thread in the Jewish Museum?*

When I started working on this article, I reviewed everything relating to the subject in our new permanent exhibition and found that, in

## Articles

a way, the whole exhibition follows a thread that repeatedly asks a question about loss and recovery. It starts with a simple question in the staircase on the way up to the exhibition floors, asked by the daughter of an old Jewish family of innkeepers, born in 1897. In the 1980s the old woman from Hohenems still lived close to the Austrian border, in a small Swiss town called Widnau, where she had moved from Hohenems with her husband in 1936. When the museum's team went to interview her in 1987, she was wise and witty. She asked back: 'What do you want to create a Jewish museum in Vorarlberg with? People will have to bring stuff in the dark.' ('Mit was kann man in Vorarlberg ein jüdisches Museum einrichten? Da müssen die Leute ja im Dunkeln das Zeug bringen.') Even in old age, Jenny Landauer attentively observed what was going on in Vorarlberg, so close to her home. And she was still wondering where all the possessions from Jewish homes and the synagogue had disappeared to fifty years before.

From Jenny Landauer's quotation on the staircase, the thread goes up into the building's attic, now hosting the part of the permanent exhibition that presents the time between 1938 and today, explicitly addressing the subject of looting and trust. On their way through the museum, visitors come across all kind of allusions to the questions of who owns the material heritage, how it was lost, and how it was sometimes recovered. One example is the long list of objects looted from the synagogue, disguised as a formal protocol signed by the mayor and the chairman of the Jewish community, listing the Tora scrolls (26), Tora binders (440), Tora curtains, Crowns, Rimmonim, and even the bronze bust of Salomon Sulzer from the synagogue's staircase. Visitors also find the paper wrapping from a package that Jewish refugees cautiously deposited with a Bregenz innkeeper before they illegally made their way over the border into Switzerland. On the wrapping paper they had written: 'for officer Gr.', that is, Paul Grüninger, a Swiss police officer who in 1938 helped hundreds of refugees to get into Switzerland and to obtain papers enabling them to stay. He had also personally smuggled their belongings through the border controls on both sides until he was fired by the Swiss authorities and the last package, waiting for him in Bregenz, was confiscated by the Gestapo. The objects in the package were carefully listed on a document that was found, along with the wrapping of the package, in the Vorarlberg State Archives when this



exhibition was being researched. But the objects themselves are long gone, having found their way in the Nazi system of looting. What remained was the wrapping and the list of valuables. Ironically, these two things, at least, were kept almost exactly where they had once been left for the courageous police officer who never came back. The State Archive today is housed in a narrow street opposite the old inn, the Gasthaus Zehbäck, whose clientele around 1938 included outlaws of all kind, political resisters, smugglers, and prostitutes.

Some of the thousand or so Displaced Persons, survivors who went to live in Hohenems and Bregenz after the war and established an Orthodox community there, also turned to smuggling. Their stories of border-crossing businesses side-stepping the rules are too numerous to tell here. They also tried to encourage locals from Hohenems to cooperate in individual acts of restitution. Like Harry Weil sen., who lived in Bregenz some of the time after the war, they published appeals for the return of ritual and other objects that they needed for their own use in the synagogue. They promised confidentiality and anonymity. But apart from one Tora mantle that appeared in the dark of the morning in front of a house one day and some Menorahs for private use which were offered in exchange for hard currency, nothing turned up. Saul Hutterer, a Bobov Orthodox who headed the DP community until 1950, kept such a Menorah sold by someone in Hohenems for the rest of his life in Antwerp. It was a cheap little piece but obviously meant a great deal to him right up to the time of his death just two years ago.

The Hohenems exhibition ends with a puzzle, a display case filled with ritual silver objects from a synagogue along with a few less 'ritual' objects like a silver spoon and a pair of silver sugar tongs (see Ill. 3). The Tora crown and the Rimmonim are the kind of exhibits more traditionally oriented visitors desperately look for in the exhibition but do not find until they reach the last display case. In 2005 the local court in Bregenz informed us that they had found a cardboard box filled with dirty old silver objects in the evidence vault, the room where old exhibits (as they are also called in the language of the court) are kept. A professional valuer, probably a jeweller, had written on the box in 1955: 'Worthless (probably Jewish) church decoration.'

The court files have long since been thrown away, the valuer has disappeared from the scene, and there is no evidence in the archives

## Articles



Illustration 3. Silver objects. By courtesy of Jewish Museum Hohenems.

or the newspapers of the time that would help us to identify the provenance of these objects. The hallmarks in the silver made it possible to identify when and where the objects were crafted. This trace led to the east, to the Ukraine, Poland, and Russia. But how did they get to Bregenz? The curators cannot give the visitors more than questions. Did a Nazi bring them back on his return from 'duties' in the east and try to sell them after the war? Did a refugee from 1938 leave this package in Bregenz? Did the objects belong to a Jewish DP after 1945 who was trying to smuggle them into Switzerland? Or did a non-Jewish DP from the Ukraine try to sell them in Vorarlberg? The story of lost and found remains open, and when visitors walk down the staircase of the museum and again see the witty old woman's remarks about bringing along stuff in the dark, different answers to this question have emerged into the light.<sup>8</sup>

Even more provokingly, the Jewish Museum in Vienna sent visitors to the 2005 exhibition *Jetzt ist er böse, der Tennenbaum* (Now he is angry, this Tennenbaum) off with a game to play. The playful exhi-

<sup>8</sup> For more information on the Jewish Museum Hohenems's permanent exhibition see Hanno Loewy (ed.), *Home Diaspora: The Jewish Museum Hohenems* (Hohenems, 2008).

bition about Austria's way of dealing with the past after the war was full of games the visitors were asked to participate in. It ended with a kind of memory box, a giant version of a letter case full of worthless memorabilia. The label said: 'These knick-knacks were bought at the local flea market without checking their provenance. Feel free to take one with you as a souvenir.' The museum had to refill the box from time to time as the visitors felt free to enjoy the game.

On a more serious note, the core of the first permanent exhibition in Vienna, opened in 1995 and curated by Felicitas Heimann-Jelinek, asked who the material heritage belongs to, and whether it is possible to reconstruct the history of the Viennese Jews after 1945 through the substance of its own materiality. It did not present the objects themselves, nor did it construct a narrative that framed their presence in a traditional way. By making the fragmented traces of the past the subject of a holographic installation it relied on the illusion of three-dimensional images projected into a virtual space that only existed for the spectator. Twenty-one large glass panels formed a rectangle inside the exhibition space that people could enter in order to decipher the holograms. The technical nature of these holographic images meant that the image was incorporated into the foil between two glass plates in an endless multitude of repetitions that, only in the eyes of the visitor, formed a three-dimensional, haptic illusion, representing a desire to grasp the past and a desperate inability to do so. The images themselves were a carefully composed still life of artefacts brought together from different archives and museums all over the world, representing certain aspects of Jewish life, culture, and history in provocative and allusive combinations.<sup>9</sup>

While in Germany artists, scholars, and the public were engaged in a debate about negative memorials such as those created by Jochen

<sup>9</sup> For discussion of the Viennese holograms see Reesa Greenberg, 'The Jewish Museum, Vienna: A Holographic Paradigm for History and the Holocaust', in Shelley Hornstein and Florence Jacobowitz (eds.), *Image and Remembrance: Representation and the Holocaust* (Bloomington, Ind., 2003), 235–50; Robin Ostow, 'Longing and Belonging—Home and Exile: The Jewish Museum in Vienna. An Anti-Heimat Museum? Or a Heimat Museum with an Accent?', in Klaus Hödl (ed.), *Der 'virtuelle Jude': Konstruktionen des Jüdischen* (Innsbruck, 2005), 71–82; Matti Bunzl, 'Of Holograms and Storage Areas: Modernity and Postmodernity at Vienna's Jewish Museum', *Cultural Anthropology*, 18/4 (2004), 435–68.

## Articles

and Esther Gerz, Horst Hoheisel, and Micha Ullman in Hamburg, Berlin, Saarbrücken, and Kassel,<sup>10</sup> a comparable discussion about the memory of the Holocaust in public space never took place in Austria. Instead, the Jewish Museum and its holograms became the focus of a permanent reflection of the possibility, ambiguity, and discomfort of exposing Jewish culture and history in a museum, forming a highly productive space of discourse.

The holograms are gone and this is not the place to discuss why and how that happened. But the questions they raised are still valid, even if the answers differ from those formulated fifteen years ago. Perhaps today they would relate more to our projections into the future than only into the past, to how our state of global migration is creating diasporas, and to identities in competition. The fact is that we are still collecting fragments and *Lumpen* (tatters), like the *Lumpensammler*, the collector Walter Benjamin imagined as his role model.

<sup>10</sup> For the discussion of 'negative memorials' see James Young, *The Art of Memory* (Munich, 1994), the catalogue of the exhibition James Young curated for the Jewish Museum New York.

HANNO LOEWY, scholar of literature and film, and a curator and writer, has been Director of the Jewish Museum Hohenems since 2004. Before that he was the founding director of the Fritz Bauer Institute in Frankfurt am Main. His many publications include *So einfach war das: Jüdische Kindheiten und Jugend in Österreich, der Schweiz und Deutschland* (2004); (ed.), *Gerüchte über die Juden: Antisemitismus, Philosemitismus und aktuelle Verschwörungstheorien* (2005); with Michael Wuliger, *Shlock Shop: Die wunderbare Welt des jüdischen Kitschs* (2005); (ed.), *Home Diaspora: The Jewish Museum Hohenems* (2008); and ed. with Gerhard Milchram, *Hast Du meine Alpen gesehen? Eine jüdische Beziehungsgeschichte* (2009).

**FAMILY FILES:  
EMOTIONS AND STORIES OF (NON-)RESTITUTION**

ATINA GROSSMANN

The intimate and inevitable connection between *Wiedergutmachung* and emotion has, in many ways, long been obvious. The battle within Israeli society over whether to accept a ‘blood money’ agreement with the Federal Republic of Germany was fierce and intensely bitter. The battle in living rooms and kitchens throughout the far-flung world of Jewish survivors and refugees over whether the potential gain of some unspecified material compensation was worth entering a *Papierkrieg* with a re-empowered German officialdom and the painful confrontation with memory and loss—as well as the necessary recognition of a sovereign Federal Republic—it would entail, was no less anguished.<sup>1</sup> And yet we are perhaps only now beginning to think, at least in an academic context, about the particular emotions aroused by claims for restitution or compensation for objects, in addition to the less literally tangible losses of freedom, health, and educational opportunity engendered by, in the language of restitution legislation, National Socialist religious, racial, and political persecution.<sup>2</sup> These meticulously constructed lists of porcelain services and silver tableware, Persian carpets, Singer sewing machines, curtains and books, velour-covered armchairs, oil paintings and lithographs, and, of course, real estate, were a key element of the complex, controversial and unwieldy process collectively and awkwardly known as *Wiedergutmachung*. Their fraught significance is only heightened, perhaps, by the fact that these ghostly reminders of a

As this article gives a historian’s personal account of her family’s and her own emotions in the context of researching the fate of her family members and their property, the editors have decided to preserve the personal quality of the spoken paper. The text is only slightly edited to produce more distanced language.

<sup>1</sup> On the bitter struggle in Israel see e.g. Tom Segev, *The Seventh Million: The Israelis and the Holocaust* (New York, 1991), 227–52.

<sup>2</sup> See e.g. Federal Ministry of Finance, *Compensation for National Socialist Injustice: Indemnification Provisions* (Berlin, 2011), 5.

## Articles

devastated world and culture were generally specific to German Jews who could document such losses rather than the majority of East European Jewish victims of the Holocaust.

The extensive archival record of this restitution process for objects makes clear that an examination of emotional responses should consider not only the refugees and survivors themselves with all their jumbled, ambivalent feelings, but also the reactions, cloaked by references to legal paragraphs and statutes, of the various German officials, attorneys, and 'experts' of all sorts handling the claims, as well as the Aryanizers, who are often an important part of the 'conversation'. Moreover, we are also pressed to think about the emotions of the descendants retrieving the files, confronting their contents, and imagining what it meant for the claimants to engage in this process with German officials and, in some cases, also directly with the new owners of what had once been theirs.

Especially at the beginning, these exchanges in which victims had to re-define themselves as legal claimants in a society that had expelled and persecuted them and where, moreover, their interlocutors were not infrequently former persecutors, read as frustrating, painful, and bureaucratically grotesque legal and semantic battles, often suffused with anti-Semitism.<sup>3</sup> To study them even now, decades later, provokes anger and a kind of disbelief. Inevitably, however, such investigations, at least in the case of bourgeois Berlin Jews such as my family, can also provoke fantasies about a grand and irretrievably destroyed 'lifestyle' (perhaps the word is appropriate here) that might have been.

### *Mixed Feelings: The Emotional Ambiguities of Fighting for Wiedergutmachungsgeld*

I grew up in a family in which that strange and misleading term, *Wiedergutmachung*, was as much part of daily conversation as the weather, the international political situation, and the lack of good cafés and

<sup>3</sup> Norbert Frei, José Brunner, and Constantin Goschler (eds.), *Die Praxis der Wiedergutmachung: Geschichte, Erfahrung und Wirkung in Deutschland und Israel* (Göttingen, 2009), 23 refers tellingly to a process by which *Verfolgte* (the victims of persecution) become *Antragssteller* (applicants).

coffee on New York's Upper West Side in the 1950s and 1960s.<sup>4</sup> My father, who had practised law in Weimar Berlin, was a restitution lawyer (*Wiedergutmachungsanwalt*) and our living room was continually filled with middle-aged German-speaking friends and clients who came with their photos and their documents and their stories, on which I sometimes eavesdropped: this one had been a promising artist, that one a renowned biochemist, a doctor with a flourishing practice, a small storeowner, or a young student expelled from university. They came to plot, together with my father, the only realistic revenge, indeed, the only 'compensation' that could still be wrested from the catastrophe, namely, material restitution, money, with all the painful pangs of conscience (*Gewissensbisse*) and mixed feelings which that implied. I sensed that my father took a great measure of bitter pleasure in pulling as much money as he possibly could out of the young Bundesrepublik, and even at a very young age I was acutely aware of the sudden turn in my family's own fortunes in 1957, when the restitution money (*Wiedergutmachungsgeld*) for our own family and for my father's clients, and his commissions, started rolling in. My father embarked on his first journey back to Europe, and I still remember the smooth suede of the elegant leather handbags he brought back from Spain for my mother, and the aura of the Continent and some long-lost luxury entering our cramped New York apartment.

Something significant had definitely shifted for German Jewish refugees in New York. The fabled *Sommerfrische* (summer holiday) suddenly moved from small inns with a German-speaking clientele and hearty Central European cooking (some kosher, some not) in the rolling hill towns of the Catskills such as Tannersville and Fleischmanns to the authentic nostalgically remembered Alps and the grand hotels of Zermatt, Sils Maria, or Arosa. The final approval of restitution legislation by the Bundestag in 1956 marked the slow end of the German Jewish Catskills. And I could palpably, physically, sense the relief that washed through the Café Éclair, the Tip Toe Inn, the afternoon *Kaffeeklatsches* of the Yekke community in New York, as the money and the pensions began to arrive, bank accounts expanded,

<sup>4</sup> For this see also Atina Grossmann, 'Versions of Home: German Jewish Refugee Papers Out of the Closet and Into the Archives', *New German Critique*, 90 (Fall 2003), 95–122.

## Articles

and a certain sense of security, mixed always with the pain of irretrievable loss (of which I was less clearly aware), settled into refugee life. So it was with that background that I came years later to my own family's records, as a historian of post-war Germany researching encounters between defeated Germans and surviving Jews, and, of course, as a curious but wary participant observer (*Betroffene*). My examples of restitution cases come, therefore, from that hybrid place, so often viewed with suspicion by professional historians, between History with a capital H and memoir. I draw from fragments of the family archive, a move emotionally and intellectually both perilous and rewarding, and hence perhaps entirely appropriate for a discussion of the 'emotions' of restitution.

### *Emotional Entanglements: The Intergenerational Legacies of Loss and Appropriation of Jewish Property*

The Grossmann family files begin with the early post-war period before the promulgation of the *Bundesentschädigungsgesetz* in 1956, covering the period starting with the first Allied restitution order, Military Law No. 59 for the *Rückerstattung feststellbarer Vermögensgegenstände an Opfer nationalsozialistischer Unterdrückungsmaßnahmen* (Restitution of Identifiable Property to Victims of Nazi Oppression) in the American zone on 10 November 1947 (adopted in the British zone in May 1949). They continue through the early 1950s after the Luxemburg Agreement of 1952, when survivors, particularly German Jews, were beginning to stake their claims to restitution of property and compensation for losses that could not in fact be 'made good' again. Their claims are part of the fraught early post-war and post-Holocaust encounters between Jews and Germans. During the occupation and 'DP' years from 1945 to 1948-9 and into the early 1950s in the Bundesrepublik, many cases were presented in actual face to face encounters with German officials. But as in the case of restitution claims submitted by German Jewish refugees now scattered throughout the globe, especially in the USA, Israel, and the United Kingdom, they were often also conducted by international airmail and mediated by lawyers on both sides of the Atlantic.

In this early stage of an ongoing process of encounter and negotiation between Germans and Jews after the defeat of the Third Reich,



in which all sides had to 'learn by doing',<sup>5</sup> the files mostly tell stories of non-restitution. They reveal a young West Germany for the most part determined to evade the recent past, and apparently entirely immune to expressions of loss, anger, or even embittered resignation, at least on the part of the claimants.

The crumbling files of my family's first *Wiedergutmachungs* effort from 1949 to 1953, based on the particular reparations edict imposed on Berlin by the Allied *Kommandatura* on 26 July 1949 (Article 23, REO, *Rückerstattungsordnung*, Order for Restitution of Identifiable Property to Victims of Nazi Oppression) tell a story that is entirely typical of the bitter gulf of experience and memory that separated those who had once been fellow Berliners after 1945.<sup>6</sup>

It is the story of a Berlin hotel which, according to a brochure published for tourists coming to Berlin in the millennium year 2000–1, was 'purchased' by the grandfather of the present owner in 1938. After having been 'partially destroyed by the vicissitudes of the second World War', the hotel is said to have 'continued its pre-war history. . . . In a house which had been constructed in 1887 according to old-fashioned artisan tradition, the charm and solidity of the past century could be preserved.'<sup>7</sup> In fact, the hotel's early post-war years were marked by a bitter battle between my father, whose parents had owned the building from 1913 to August 1938, and the then owners over that pre-war history, the sordid events of Aryanization, and the forced sale of Jewish property in Nazi Berlin.

My grandmother, Gertrud Grossmann, who had taken over the property after her husband's death in 1931, managed to elude her first deportation order for almost a year and a half, but in 1943, the 39th *Osttransport* deported her to Auschwitz where she was mur-

<sup>5</sup> Frei, Brunner, and Goschler (eds.), *Die Praxis der Wiedergutmachung*, 12.

<sup>6</sup> For a more detailed account of the story see Atina Grossmann, *Jews, Germans, and Allies: Close Encounters in Occupied Germany* (Princeton, 2007), 112–14, 309–10, nn. 88 and 89. See *Wiedergutmachungsamt*, Berlin, 2WGA 1490/50 (Walter Grossmann) and 2WGA 3253/50 (Franz and Hans S. Grossmann). All quotations in the following paragraphs come from these sources. See also Atina Grossmann, "'The survivors were few and the dead were many': Jewish Identity and Memory in Occupied Berlin", in Marion Kaplan and Beate Meyer (eds.), *Jüdische Welten: Juden in Deutschland vom 18. Jahrhundert bis in die Gegenwart* (Göttingen, 2005), 317–35.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.* 332.

## Articles

dered. Gertrud's three sons survived. One was liberated at Mauthausen after having made it through two years in Auschwitz; another had settled as a doctor in Hartford, Connecticut; and the third, my father, had spent the war as an enemy alien interned by His Majesty's Government in British India. Now the two physicians were counting on their brother, the former Berlin lawyer, to use the reparations edict forced on Berlin by the Allied *Kommandatura* on 26 July 1949 to rescue what he could. While the new owners claimed that they had acquired the hotel by 'a completely apolitical and economically justified contract in which no coercion or pressure of any kind had been applied', my father's memories of the 1938 transactions, transcribed in the court papers, were furiously different from the their innocuous version. According to my father, the new owner

had repeatedly boasted of his good connections to the party . . . and that if my mother did not sell him the house on his terms, he would find ways and means to acquire it in any case. Considering the general lack of basic rights for Jews in Germany . . . my mother and I decided it was only prudent to accede to his threats.<sup>8</sup>

After a lengthy and bitter court battle, the *Wiedergutmachungskammer* (Restitution Court) of the Landgericht Berlin on 14 September 1953 finally ordered the hotelier to pay the heirs of Gertrud Grossmann the modest sum of DM 20,000. This was at the time less than \$5000; the Grossmanns had claimed a value of DM 110,000 to DM 125,000.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Grossmann, *Jews, Germans, and Allies*, 114.

<sup>9</sup> For discussion of similar unsatisfactory legal struggles around 'Aryanized' property, using similar language, see Ronald Webster, 'Jüdische Rückkehrer in der BRD nach 1945: Ihre Motive, ihre Erfahrungen', *Aschkenas: Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Juden*, 5/1 (1995), 47-77. In fact, there were so many celebrations of fifty years of business ownership in 1988, half a century after the expropriation of Jewish property in Nazi Germany, that some localities embarrassedly asked their merchants to curtail their self-congratulatory advertising as it was a bit too obvious (*peinlich*), *ibid.* 72. As with so many issues concerning Jews in post-war occupied Germany, the situation in Berlin was unique in that a reparations edict had already been forced on Berlin by the Allied *Kommandatura* on 26 July 1949, well before the federal restitution programme was approved by the Bundestag in 1956. Article 23 REO, 'Restitution of Identifiable Property to Victims of Nazi Oppression

There is a small coda to this story which suggests how raw the emotions connected to the ownership of Aryanized property might still be. Shortly after a brief article about my research on this piece of German history appeared in one of the last issues of the German Jewish refugee weekly *Aufbau*,<sup>10</sup> I received a letter from a grandson of the hotel's new owners. It is, I think, worth quoting from this letter (in the rather awkward English translation he helpfully appended):

I cannot comprehend the anachronistic relation between the afore mentioned acquisition and the work of a descendant of the purchaser, who is director of the hotel two generations later. I can see the point you are trying to make but it is unscientific (*unwissenschaftlich*) in my opinion. I must say, though, that the purpose of it all is totally mysterious to me (*völlig schleierhaft*). The accusation that you are making in your article is hitting someone who did not experience World War II (born in 1948) and thus cannot be held responsible for the crimes of this era. Nevertheless, like for every other human – at least in Germany – it is my duty [to] keep these events in mind, so that there will never be a repetition [and to] always be openminded and without prejudices when to comes to person's color of skin, religion, or nationality.<sup>11</sup>

And then came a key point which suggested that he did indeed have his own very real material concerns about the 'purpose of it all'. 'Because of this, the whole issue of the *purchase* [*sic*] is settled in my mind', and then he added, ritualistically, 'regardless of the timeless criticism concerning the way Germans behaved toward Jewish fellow citizens (the proverbial *Mitbürger jüdischen Glaubens*)'.

from January 30, 1933 to May 8, 1945 on grounds of race, creed, nationality, or political beliefs' stated: 'Where . . . the affected property has undergone fundamental changes which have substantially enhanced its value the Restitution Chamber may order the delivery of an adequate substitute in lieu of restitution. It shall consider the value of the property at the time of the unjust deprivation and the rights and interests of the parties.'

<sup>10</sup> *Aufbau*, 13 (July 2002), 13.

<sup>11</sup> Reference to this letter is also made in Grossmann, *Jews, Germans, and Allies*, 310, n. 89.

## Articles

I never responded to this anxious missive, having already decided for myself that I was not willing to invest the resources of time, money, energy, and, indeed, emotion to wage the re-opened legal battle that the grandson/owner of the Hotel Astoria obviously feared, just as for a host of reasons that I have not fully unravelled, I did not manage to pursue the 'looted art' case urged upon me by a zealous German attorney in order to discover, retrieve, or receive compensation for the impressive art collection that an uncle, the architect Leo Nachtlicht, had auctioned, sold, lost, sometime between 1932 and 1943. I preferred to take my minor but nevertheless heartfelt revenge in historical research and publication and ensuring, among other things, that representatives of Jewish organizations no longer booked accommodation at the hotel, a point that became moot in 2009 when the family finally gave up the ghost (literally I would say) and sold out to a hotel chain.

Imagine my surprise, then, when I recently discovered during casual conversation that the son of this letter-writer, that is, the great-grandson of the Aryanizer (who had been mentioned in the letter as a budding student of history) had indeed become a historian of National Socialism *and*, this is the intriguing kicker, had apparently still complained about the shamelessness and *Unwissenschaftlichkeit* of my accusations.<sup>12</sup> This story underscores the premise that the question of the 'emotions of restitution' should surely be extended not only to the descendants of the victims – those of us who are reading the files and reflecting on the consequences of those proceedings, which did indeed have a very real impact on the course of our lives – but also to the heirs of the spoils.

<sup>12</sup> This story is, admittedly, based on hearsay but it is sufficiently telling that I mention it here, albeit with the warning adjective 'apparently'. The best known articulation of this conflict between ostensibly 'objective' history of the Third Reich and 'subjective', presumably more emotional and hence unreliable study, is probably the famous exchange between the Martin Broszat and Saul Friedländer. See their articles collected in Peter Baldwin (ed.), *Reworking the Past: Hitler, the Holocaust, and the Historians' Debate* (Boston, 1990).

*Objects, Emotions, and (Failed) Lernprozesse in  
Post-War Restitution Cases*

It is worthwhile, therefore, to think a bit further about the barely suppressed emotions that reveal themselves to the attentive (and personally engaged) reader of these documents. Norbert Frei, José Brunner, and Constantin Goschler point out in their detailed edited study of the processes of *Wiedergutmachung*, especially between Germany and Israel, that in a strange but powerful way, it was precisely those difficult, often agonizing, restitution cases that provided, indeed forced, the major forum for a post-war encounter between German Jewish survivors and the country from which they had been expelled.<sup>13</sup> This process unfolded sometimes in the direct form of a return to Germany in order to facilitate the processing of claims, and sometimes from afar, in letters, legal documents, and interactions (almost always distinctly unpleasant) with representatives of German consulates, including the dreaded (often Jewish) *Vertrauensärzte* and psychiatrists who adjudicated disability claims. Over time, with shifting politics, this *Praxis*, Frei, Brunner, and Goschler *et al.* persuasively argue, can be understood as ‘ein[...] permanente[r] Lernprozess der daran beteiligten Gruppen und Gesellschaften’ (a permanent learning process on the part of the groups and societies involved in it).<sup>14</sup>

Indeed, the German restitution bureaucrats, the lawyers for the Aryanizers, and all those on the receiving end of the claims, could have, had they been willing, learned a great deal about the lives of their former fellow citizens. As Leora Auslander has so wonderfully shown in her sensitive readings of French restitution claims, the files open up rich and poignant portraits of lives comfortably lived and then suddenly, traumatically disrupted.<sup>15</sup> We find detailed CVs, often laboriously reconstructed without the help of the proper documents, lost in lifts (shipping containers) gone astray, in hasty flight through multiple destinations. Claimants submitted narrative *Lebensläufe* dutifully notarized (*Eidesstattliche Versicherung*), cataloguing –

<sup>13</sup> Frei, Brunner, and Goschler (eds.), *Die Praxis der Wiedergutmachung*.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.* 23.

<sup>15</sup> Leora Auslander, ‘Beyond Words’, *American Historical Review*, 110/4 (2005), 1015–45.

## Articles

with the proud defensiveness of those forced to prove what had once been self-evident—schooling, degrees, social position, truncated bright futures, as well as the hurdles to emigration, the difficulties of starting anew in old professions, and the fees and costs associated with new licences and degrees. They submitted lists of their curious transitional jobs (the proverbial German Jewish Fuller Brush salesman standing at our apartment back door remains a vivid figure), and painstaking comparisons of past and current (much) lower incomes. They received affidavits from friends and colleagues all over the new international refugee universe attesting to the veracity of the claims about a lost high standard of living. In my father's case, a former law partner now living in Buenos Aires attested on 15 January 1954 to the lost pleasures of Weimar bourgeois life with its taken for granted balance of work and leisure (certainly an object of envy for our hurried generation) and added, 'even though only 30 years old in 1933 he had already built up a successful practice that would surely have generated a growing income—had not 1933 intervened'.<sup>16</sup>

At the outset, however, this *Lernprozess* involved for the claimants, as I think my father's disposition suggests, a toxic mix of disappointment, frustration, fury, and confirmation of suspicions about the German refusal of responsibility. Particularly striking is the refugees' bitter sarcasm about the blatant injustice, the callous disregard of recent history, the grasping for bits of authority by newly re-empowered West German officials chagrined at having to deal with such unpleasant matters. The initial answers, certainly pre-1956, come carefully embellished with references to a multitude of legal paragraphs, concluding with a monotonous *nein, nein, nein* as claims were rejected. Current economic or professional difficulties described in these early claims were attributed to the obstacles imposed by emigration and destination nations (for example, in the case of Britain, internment as an enemy alien), rather than by Nazi persecution. The causal relation between the Nazi expulsion and the multiple losses and injuries of emigration, in contrast to those sustained while still in Germany, including the irony of incarcerating fleeing Jews as a potential fifth column of Nazi sympathizers, was simply denied, not recognized: 'nein, die Voraussetzungen sind . . . nicht gegeben (no, the conditions are . . . not met).'

<sup>16</sup> Hans S. Grossmann file, 2WGA 3253/50.

In my father's case, an entirely logical if perhaps predictably quixotic effort to argue that had his passport not been marked by the clearly National Socialist addition of a 'J' and the added middle name of 'Israel', his plan to emigrate from a first refuge in Tehran to the USA via the Soviet Union and Japan would not have been derailed by the denial of a transit visa by a Japanese regime allied with Germany. Without that Nazi imposed 'racial' marking, he would not have been coerced into a risky journey through British India to catch a boat from Bombay to San Francisco, culminating in five years of entrapment in India, during which he lost, as the text with which I close this essay reflects, the remnants of his 'respectable' identity: his remaining savings; his affidavit and visa for the USA; his professional outfits and credentials; whatever possessions he had managed to transport from Berlin to Tehran during his first hasty flight after 1933; and his chance to start over in the USA half a decade earlier, as a younger, healthier, and less traumatized man.

Such reasoning, intelligible as it may seem to us, proved, of course, utterly unconvincing to German officials disinclined to take any responsibility for the wartime actions of their post-war occupiers. The Berlin *Wiedergutmachungsamt* in 1956 explicitly denied any connection between the 'aus rassischen Gründen erfolgten Auswanderung des Antragsstellers im Jahre 1936 und dem Freiheitsschaden im Jahre 1941' (the applicant's emigration for racial reasons in 1936 and the loss of freedom in 1941).<sup>17</sup> And these stories, it is useful to keep in mind, are those of former German citizens who, according to the text of the *Bundesentschädigungsgesetz* (BEG) belonged to the 'deutschen Sprach- und Kulturkreis' (German language and cultural sphere) and were, from the outset, privileged in their entitlement to compensation by comparison, for example, with stateless Eastern European Displaced Persons in Germany who could only press claims based on harm to health and 'loss of freedom'.<sup>18</sup>

It is important to recall, therefore, that for all the success story of *Wiedergutmachung* – and in many ways it is a story of a kind of justice finally rendered and of a carefully orchestrated encounter between perpetrators and victims – the early years reflect precisely the sheer 'deep-rooted, stubborn, and at times vicious refusal to face and come

<sup>17</sup> WGA files, Hans S. Grossmann.

<sup>18</sup> Frei, Brunner, and Goschler (eds.), *Die Praxis der Wiedergutmachung*, 26.

## Articles

to terms with what really happened', as Hannah Arendt put it so brilliantly in her essay 'Visit to Germany' in 1950.<sup>19</sup> They are a key part of what Jewish observers in the post-war years termed the 'enigma of irresponsibility'.<sup>20</sup>

The responses by claimants came, as in my father's submissions, with fury wrapped in Prussian formality and seared by a knowing sarcasm. My maternal grandfather, who had survived in hiding in Berlin, was laconic in his retort to the Senator für Finanzen in West Berlin on 25 July 1953 which, using the very documents he had submitted in his initial claim, had established that the Oberfinanzpräsidium (OFP) files documenting my grandmother's deportation from the Große Hamburger Strasse ten years earlier clearly showed that, after all, he had no more possessions at that time. Accordingly, any additional claims would have to be buttressed by a precise accounting of each individual *entzogenen* (misappropriated) item. He was enjoined to describe and to prove 'wann, wo, auf welche Weise und durch welche Dienststelle des vormaligen Deutschen Reiches eine ungerechtfertigte Entziehung zugunsten eines der von mir zu vertretenden Rechtsträger erfolgt ist' (when, where, and how a misappropriation was made by which office of the former German Reich in favour of a legal entity which I am to represent). In the absence of such evidence, no compensation could be provided. So my grandfather tried again, consciously deploying the language of his tormentors: he had lived in a 'sogennannten herrschaftlichen Haushalt' (so-called grand household, the adjective 'so-called' adding a level of irony), buttressed by his wife's substantial dowry, with expensive décor, over 1,000 books (which a Friedenau bookseller had relieved him of for DM 30 when he moved to a *Judenhaus*), even a *Sportboot* (racing boat) that the impassioned *Turner* (gymnast) had anchored at the Spree Ruderklub Grünau rowing club, and a *Diplom* (certificate) as a fencer. The former 'illegal' (*U-Boot*), who unlike most German Jewish claimants had directly experienced the wartime Third Reich,

<sup>19</sup> Hannah Arendt, *The Aftermath of Nazi Rule: Report from Germany* (1941). The German translation was published as *Besuch in Deutschland* (Berlin, 1993).

<sup>20</sup> Term used by American Jewish occupation official Moses Moskowitz, 'The Germans and the Jews. Postwar Report: The Enigma of German Irresponsibility', *Commentary*, 2 (July-Dec, 1946), 7-14. See also Hannah Arendt's similar reflections in her classic text, 'The Aftermath of Nazi Rule: Report from Germany', *Commentary*, 10 (Oct. 1950), 342-53.



wrote: 'Die Schuld des Nazireiches brauche ich wohl nicht erst nachzuweisen . . . Ich darf wohl annehmen, dass diese Angaben genügen' (I presume that I do not have to furnish proof of the Nazi Reich's guilt. . . I presume that I may take it that these details are sufficient). But of course they were not, the *Antrag* (application) was rejected again, and his request that the precious remaining photos of his *herrschaftlichen* quarters that he had submitted as 'proof' be returned to him was not fulfilled, as I discovered decades later when I retrieved (and I might add, against all regulations, absconded with) them from his *Wiedergutmachungsakte* in 2002.<sup>21</sup>

Interestingly, in the particular family files that I have examined, the most loving and pained detail, it seems, is provided for the more mundane, the more everyday objects, the 'modern' (an insistent emphasis) as well as 'luxurious' domestic objects, a double bed, an armchair upholstered in velour, a *Rauchtisch* (smoking table), rather than for the items that solicit bewildered gasps from me today: oil paintings by Otto Dix and Kokoschka, several ('original' it says in parentheses) drawings by Degas and Liebermann, as well as 'weitere Oelgemälde . . . kann ich mich nicht besinnen' (further oil paintings . . . I cannot recall) that had graced the elegant apartment of the architect Nachtlicht at Trautenaustraße 10, Berlin Wilmersdorf. One of the Nachtlicht daughters made this clear in her claim on behalf of her parents. With her well-known father dead (perhaps by suicide) shortly before his planned deportation and her mother killed at Auschwitz, she clearly mourned her sheet music and violin as much as the Bluethner grand piano and the valuable artwork. For her, a skilled musician now living the peculiar life of the European exile—privileged as white, but alien and disoriented as Jewish and a refugee—in southern Africa, those were for her the 'unersetzlichen Gegenstände' (irreplaceable objects).<sup>22</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Heinrich Busse file, 62WGA 2671/51.

<sup>22</sup> WGA file 2671/51, Nachtlicht. The file includes an affidavit from an 'Aryan' neighbour who continued to visit the couple until the end in 1942, attesting to her own memories of the luxurious home, the last-minute move to a *Judenhaus* in the same street, the gradual forced sale or confiscation of the possessions, and the couple's progressive impoverishment. A relatively 'satisfactory' restitution settlement was finally reached on 10 Feb. 1959. Interestingly, in an indication of the long reach of 'emotions of restitution',

## Articles

It is the private items that loom most vividly, quite in contrast to the values we set today – a circumstance that contributes in part to my confused discomfort with current efforts to research and claim ‘looted art’ so many decades later, so removed from the experiences of its owners or even their children. I understand the politics of holding the Aryanizers, and the German galleries and museums that still will not fully account for the provenance of their holdings responsible, but I am uncomfortable with distant relatives profiting potentially massively so long after the fact, and uncomfortable also with my own fantasies – ‘oh if only I had just one of those Degas or that Lovis Corinth’ – about how my own life or that of my children, even further removed, could be, or could have been, transformed by sudden riches acquired and lost in such a different world.

*Wiedergutmachung* claims reveal or at least suggest the emotions of the now adult children who had escaped, buttressed by the eyewitness testimony of those who had been there and remembered. The daughter-in-law of another uncle attested that her husband was still so depressed by his inability to save his mother and brother that she had taken over the restitution process. She remembered helping her mother-in-law turn in valuable jewellery, diamond brooches, the very finest silver, and, in fact, added sketches of these objects, reconjured from memory in 1961. The two women had, she added, taken a taxi to the *Sammelstelle* (collection point) in the Jägerstrasse, the silver carried in two *Waschkörbe* (laundry baskets). The family maid, who still lived in Berlin and had submitted an earlier unsuccessful affidavit in October 1959, was most impressed by the family silver, really *edel* (high quality), she insisted, not mere *Hotelsilber* (hotel silver), some two *Zentner* (hundredweight) of butter and cheese knives, soup spoons, and a full fish service as well as jewellery. The *Sammelstelle*, she noted, still provided receipts, although those documents of confiscation and loss were also long since lost. In her recollection, however, the most valuable item, a glittering pearl necklace she valued at RM 16,000 had, in a desperate and defiant act of trying to maintain some resource that might buy some food or maybe a visa, not been

the current occupants of the apartment in the Trautenaustraße have initiated a *Stolperstein* commemoration for the Nachtlichts and some ninety other Jewish neighbours in the same street; the memorial ceremony with the laying of the stumbling stones, welcomed by some and determinedly ignored by other current residents of the street, is scheduled for 29 Apr. 2012.

handed over but hidden away; it was discovered later during a Gestapo raid. For that item there was no receipt. But all those receipts, even had they been preserved, would have proved useless, at least for the West Berlin authorities in the 1950s. These carefully reconstructed inventories of once secure and comfortable affluent lives, 'Tafelsilber für 24 Personen (komplett doppelt), Fischbestecke, Kuchengabeln, Teesiebe, Tortenheber, etc.' (silver cutlery for 24 people, full settings doubled, fish knives and forks, cake forks, tea strainers, cake servers, etc.) that had been duly confiscated and recorded could not be considered for compensation because the *Sammelstelle* collecting Jewish-owned goods in 1939 had been located in the Jägerstrasse which was now assigned to East Berlin, and the relevant regulations (*Rechtssprechung des Kammergerichts*) conveniently only applied to 'den örtlichen Bereich der heutigen Westsektoren Berlins' (the jurisdiction of Berlin's present-day Western sectors). The West Berlin authorities did not consider themselves responsible for compensating any objects that had been delivered to a site now behind the iron curtain.<sup>23</sup>

Many claims which had been summarily and repeatedly rejected in the early years of the Federal Republic were finally resolved, more or less, in 1959. The *Lernprozess* began excruciatingly haltingly with encounters grounded in polarized memory and mutual suspicion. The history of this process remains unworked through, especially perhaps for the heirs of those who enriched themselves, or simply made their lives and homes more pleasant, more decorative, more 'modern', with Jewish goods and property, but also for those of us reading history – of everyday life, of material culture, of the post-war encounter between Jews and Germans – through the files of the *Wiedergutmachungsämter*.

*The Wishlist: Fantasies Aroused by Lost Objects*

And then there is another level of emotion that connects to that which cannot be restituted, which resists the – not to be cavalierly dismissed – monetary compensation offered by even belated *Wiedergutmachung*. These are the immaterial losses, the identities forever disrupted that could never be put back together again, even if some

<sup>23</sup> WGA Freudenthal file.

## Articles

refugees, especially the younger ones, especially those, like many German Jews, who managed to arrive at their final destinations before the war and were able to acquire precious medical or legal licences, establish businesses, and identify with the Allies during the war, built new and often satisfying lives for themselves. Interestingly, however, these profound, intangible losses are often linked to the re-imagining, and then listing, of particular objects.

Indeed, digging further in the musty family archives, still unsorted and stored in my basement, I discovered another layer that speaks precisely to memories and fantasies aroused by lost objects or the lost lives such objects could represent. One particular find stopped me in my tracks, precisely because its poignant mix of the personal/idiosyncratic and the generalizable/‘historical’ speaks, it seems to me, directly to the emotional and intellectual difficulties of recruiting one’s own family stories into the writing of what we think of as history.

In the cellar of my house in Long Island, still crowded with boxes of embarrassingly unpacked family memorabilia, still ‘un-worked through after decades’, in which I periodically try to make a dent, I happened upon a text, somewhere between a list and a poem, typed on blue airmail paper. The underlined heading read *Wunschtraum: Wish dream after 10 years Inner Asia, 5 years India, and 6 months Bombay*, and it had been composed by my father in Bombay after five years of internment by the British in the Himalayas, following five years as a refugee in Tehran, and then six months of living in limbo in Bombay. He had been freed from the camps, but, visa-and-asset-less, was still not free to leave India. His list of ‘wish dreams’ reflects the very specific desires of a quintessential Berlin Jew, a lawyer with a taste for the good life of what used to be called a ‘salon Communist’, nostalgic for the accoutrements of a bourgeois, European life long since left behind, living in a tropical world that was, as he always used to remember, with irony, no place for a Berlin lawyer. At the same time, it piercingly articulates the classic yearnings of a stateless refugee (and former prisoner) without a passport, without papers, living out of suitcases, speaking the patois of the uprooted, who has lost access to his own language or any elegant language, without money or property, condemned to idleness (except the busyness of trying to free oneself and find a place in the world), reduced, as he says, to writing applications pleading for a return to individual agency and political identity/citizenship.

The text tells us, it seems to me, so much about what it means to be free and not free, what we take for granted, and what becomes important when one has, as the refugees had, survived a war and a Holocaust, avoided the very worst, but lost so much of what constituted one's identity and those one had loved, while still maintaining, as so many refugees did, a sense of humour and a zest for life and new adventures. There is nostalgia here, but it is NOT the oft-cited homesickness for a world—for the vanished German Jewish life—that had clearly disappeared irrevocably and to which one could never ever go home again. Interestingly, there is also a kind of nostalgia for the early years of flight, for the exotic life in Iran, and, of course, for the romance with my mother, whom he is trying to convince, after five long years of separation (and all male existence), to relinquish her own free and adventurous life in Persia and join him in what he hopes will be a new beginning in the USA or, surprising for me to read, perhaps in Palestine.

The shock of recognition when I pulled out and read the typed blue aerogramme-style paper was profound: his voice vivid, suffused with the self-irony that seemed to sustain so many German Jews through their multiple emigration journeys. He expresses (in clearly gender and class inflected terms) the longing to escape the tropics back into 'culture' (never mind that that culture had turned incomprehensively barbaric). But he also, it seemed to me, channelled all the descriptions and analyses of refugee status that I had encountered in historical and theoretical texts (especially the classics by Hannah Arendt on statelessness and being a refugee); so many thoughts and fantasies tumbling out and mixed up in this one private text, the personal and the political inextricably intertwined. There are only hints of all that is unspoken, such as grief at not only the separation from but also the murder of loved ones (although acknowledged in other documents, including an extraordinary *Kaddish* he recited and recorded for the already defined six million victims at a service he led for fellow internees shortly after VE Day), as well as sexual longings and memories, alluded to but not directly articulated. He already knows a good deal, but certainly not everything, about the enormity of what has happened and what he has lost. He can, it appears, still imagine a reunion with lost family and friends; in 1946 in Bombay, such a possibility is not yet completely ruled out. I include some samples in the order in which they were typed, col-

## Articles

lected under the heading, *Ich möchte wieder einmal* (I would like to once again).

Sleep at night under a woollen blanket  
Go to the theatre  
See only people dressed in European garb  
See shows and go skiing  
Live in a room furnished accorded to my own taste  
See a green forest and a meadow  
One day not have to talk about internment and release  
Sit at the wheel of a car  
Chat about the latest and not so latest events (*letzten und vorletzten Dinge*)  
Read a good French book  
Not only spend money, but also earn some  
See once again all those with whom I now only exchange letters  
Eat a good roast goose  
Write a book about the last five years  
Be able to unpack all my suitcases  
Lie in a tiled bathtub  
Have a 'Heimat' [with the scare quotation marks, and I felt somehow that here the term 'scare' applied]  
Be able to master a foreign language perfectly  
Express myself in a perfect German  
Possess a bank account  
Travel on a big ship  
Be liberated from my chronic cough  
Go hiking in the mountains  
Not have every day be a Sunday (*nicht alle Tage Sonntag haben*)  
Wear a woollen suit and a winter coat  
Weigh 10 kg. less  
Live without mosquitoes, cockroaches, and moths  
Have someone sew on a button for me  
Live in another city  
Listen to a good symphony concert  
Ride on an Arabian steed (memories of Iran)  
Have a profession (*Beruf*)  
Ride the subway / *U-Bahn*  
Experience the difference between summer and winter  
Be liberated from the attribute 'refugee'  
See only people who are not in uniform  
Own a gramophone with good records  
Have guests  
Be able to enjoy the anticipation of a vacation

Know where I will find myself in 6 months  
Not give reason to be pitied  
Eat gooseberry tart with whipped cream  
Not have to talk to anyone for 24 hours  
Fly on an aeroplane and ride a motorcycle  
Appear as a defence attorney  
Put on a dinner jacket (*Smoking*)  
Really celebrate my birthday (*feiern*)  
Read Heinsche (and other) poetry aloud  
Have a night lamp [the power to turn the light on and off at will]  
Feel fresh and rested when I wake up in the morning, just once  
Own a library  
Not hear anything about Indian politics  
Be able to correspond without airmail stamps  
See happy people in my immediate environs  
Take a walk (*Spaziergang*)  
Be liberated from the diseases of playing cards (*Patience-Legen*)  
Go out without sunglasses  
Be required to leave for somewhere every morning at a particular time  
Have all my cavities filled  
Be 20 years younger  
Take my meals at times agreeable to me  
Spend a night alone in the moonlight  
Not to have to live only from 'photos'  
See a Raphael, Rembrandt, Renoir, Rodin in a museum  
Tinker with a radio  
Live without applications  
Own a suit that fits  
Travel to Switzerland  
See the rest [meaning what???] of my family reunited  
Much more, which will remain here and now unarticulated (*unausgesprochen*)

What do I make of such a text, suffused with yearning for objects as well as emotions, about an identity linked to those objects of bourgeois existence? It captures, I think, the sensibility of the refugee, the adventure of the Orient, the experience of the internee, the uncertainty of statelessness, the pain of longing. The historian's question, of course, is: does it tell a specific story that is also generalizable? And perhaps most confusingly, at the 'personal' level, how does this text match up with my memories of a man who did make it again to a museum, to a symphony, to custom-made suits, to light switches,

## Articles

telephones, and a passport, even to practise as an attorney, but never managed to regain those twenty years, his health, his lost family, or his intact sense of bourgeois identity. And yet, the family archives also contain artefacts of the new life that did begin, the transformation of refugees and survivors into citizens of new homes. Particularly striking to me: a dinner menu, with pompous names for what seemed like dreadful British food, from one of my parents' final refugee crossings, representing that liminal state between being a stateless displaced person and a once-again regular passenger on an (albeit converted troopship) ocean liner, the *SS Aquitania*, which finally arrived in New York harbour on 5 February 1947.

These are topics that belong not only to the psychoanalysts, therapists, and fiction writers to whom they have been consigned. They need to be integrated into a new and evolving history of emotions which considers especially questions of intergenerational transmission and the fraught, mostly invisible, ways in which objects, tangible and remembered, still link the heirs of the looted and the looters.

ATINA GROSSMANN is Professor of Modern European and German History and Gender Studies at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Cooper Union, New York. She has worked extensively on German-Jewish history in the post-war era. Her many publications include *Reforming Sex: The German Movement for Birth Control and Abortion Reform, 1920–1950* (1995), and *Jews, Germans, and Allies: Close Encounters in Occupied Germany* (2007), which was awarded the Fraenkel Prize in Contemporary History from the Wiener Library in London, the George L. Mosse Prize of the American Historical Association (2007), and selected as one of the best books of the year (2008) by H-Soz-u-Kult. Her current research focuses on transnational Jewish refugee stories, 'Soviet Central Asia, Iran, and India: Sites of Refuge and Relief for European Jews During World War II'.



## REVIEW ARTICLE

### ***OBJECTS AND EMOTIONS EXHIBITED: TWO CATALOGUES ON RAUB UND RESTITUTION***

CHLOE PAVER

INKA BERTZ and MICHAEL DORRMANN for the Jüdisches Museum Berlin and the Jüdisches Museum Frankfurt am Main (eds.), *Raub und Restitution: Kulturgut aus jüdischem Besitz von 1933 bis heute*, exhibition catalogue (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2008), 326 pp. with 135 ill. ISBN 978 3 8353 0361 4. €24.90

ALEXANDRA REININGHAUS (ed.), *Recollecting: Raub und Restitution*, exhibition catalogue (Vienna: Passagen Verlag, 2009), 349 pp. ISBN 978 3 8516 5887 3. €34.45

These two impressive catalogues document exhibitions which investigated the systematic dispossession of German and Austrian Jews under National Socialism. The exhibitions from which the two catalogues have taken their respective titles focused on the theft or forced sale of art objects and other personal possessions such as books and furniture, that is, on the *Kulturgut* which has been the subject of the latest wave of restitution cases (as distinct from the properties, businesses, life savings, pensions, and insurance policies that were likewise stolen but whose restitution was generally dealt with, if at all, before 1989). As the shared wording 'Raub und Restitution' signals, both exhibitions were concerned not simply with the fact of the theft but with the fate of the objects and their owners, or their owners' surviving descendants, after 1945. The exhibition *Raub und Restitution* was organized jointly by the Jüdisches Museum Berlin and the Jüdisches Museum der Stadt Frankfurt am Main, and was shown at these two museums in 2008 and 2009 respectively. *Recollecting* was mounted by MAK, Austria's museum of the applied arts, in the winter of 2008–9.

How can we account for the coincidence of timing and titles in Berlin and Vienna? While the author of this review did not visit the

## Review Article

exhibitions and is therefore reviewing the catalogues as books in their own right, she can briefly set them in the context of the many hundreds of German and Austrian exhibitions which, over the last ten to twenty years, have explored aspects of the National Socialist past and its legacies. Exhibitions about looted possessions form an interesting sub-category of this corpus.

Important exhibitions appeared in Austria in the wake of the restitution law of 1998 which obliged state-run museums to conduct thorough provenance research on their holdings. Conceptually, the most interesting of these exhibitions were *Inventarisiert* at the Austrian state furniture depot (exh. cat. Vienna, 2000) and *Jetzt ist er böse, der Tannenbaum* at the Jewish Museum Vienna (exh. cat. Vienna, 2005). *Inventarisiert* acknowledged the furniture depot's institutional responsibility for thefts from which it had profited by refusing to exhibit objects to which it now believed the depot had never had a moral right. Instead, a photographic installation kept the objects, many of them degraded by decades of use in state-owned properties, at a distance from the viewer. By thus breaching the normal contract between museum and visitor—the unspoken promise of access to objects—the exhibition aimed to promote reflection about rights of possession and the right to view. *Jetzt ist er böse, der Tannenbaum* ranged more widely across Austria's inadequate post-war responses to the Holocaust, but restitution, or the lack of it, was a central theme. The curators used parodies of children's games, in which visitors were invited to participate, to provide a sarcastic comment on the bureaucratic obstacles that were wilfully put in the way of those survivors or descendants who attempted to reclaim property in the immediate post-war decades. It is no surprise, then, that one of the two catalogues under review here represents a further—and more elaborate—Austrian attempt to tackle this topic in the museum.

Restitution activity was also revived in Germany in the wake of the Washington Declaration of 1998, though by means of a joint declaration of the *Bund* and the *Länder*, rather than by a change to the law. There has since been a whole series of local and regional exhibitions about the 'aryanization' process, testifying to the now well-established tendency to 'localize' the memory of National Socialist crime in Germany. This has included a series of exhibitions by university libraries (most recently at the universities of Leipzig and Göttingen) about looted books in their collections. The no-nonsense

term *Raub* was arguably established in 2002 by *Legalisierter Raub: Der Fiskus und die Ausplünderung der Juden in Hessen 1933–1945*, a regional exhibition mounted by the Fritz Bauer Institute. *Raub und Restitution*, the German exhibition catalogue reviewed here, brings similar research to a national audience.

Of the two catalogues under review, the German *Raub und Restitution* is the more conventional, offering a thorough historical documentation of the theft and restitution of cultural artefacts, with contributions by almost forty academics and museum professionals. The contents page presents the myriad contributions visually to the reader as a series of layers of information, while in the catalogue itself these are picked out in different coloured paper. The 'top' layer comprises what one might call 'meta-texts' on the exhibition: two general essays about the processes of theft and restitution, one by historian Dan Diner, and a series of interviews with people involved in current restitution activities (academics, art dealers, lawyers, and so on). These are interspersed between fifteen case studies of theft from individuals or institutions, detailing the often unsuccessful attempts to achieve restitution after 1945; and these, in turn, are interleaved with detailed historical analyses of institutions involved either in the theft or in national processes of restitution. While this layering may appear over-elaborate, it does make visible the underlying structuring principles of what might otherwise seem a loose collection of texts on diverse aspects of theft and restitution. The inclusion of interviews with academics and other experts is consistent with other recent attempts (for instance at the *Topographie des Terrors* exhibition in Berlin, opened in 2010) to present history as an ongoing process of dialogue between academics rather than as a set of agreed facts whose authority the visitor is invited to accept.

In their introduction to *Raub und Restitution*, the editors Inka Bertz and Michael Dorrman argue that their exhibition moves beyond a simplistic appeal to the viewer's admiration for notable stolen artworks, which they see as a characteristic of earlier (unspecified) exhibitions. Instead, they set out to document and analyse the looting processes, broadening the subject out from the few well-known cases of stolen paintings to include case studies of stolen books, archives, ceramics, and musical instruments as well as essays on theft and restitution in the occupied territories. The catalogue brings to light many lesser-known details: the competition between the RSHA and

## Review Article

the Einsatzstab Reichsleiter Rosenberg for first access to lootable property in the occupied territories; the SD's practice of stealing libraries and archives, including Jewish libraries, in order to study how the 'enemy' thought; the role of the American Collecting Points in collating, cataloguing, and restituting or re-distributing art objects after 1945; and the international diplomacy involved in France's offer to return Russian documents that were in the possession of the French state to Russia in exchange for the return of stolen French archives.

One potential limitation of the documentary approach taken by the German exhibition is that the emotional consequences and legacies of dispossession are treated only peripherally. Nevertheless, emotion forms an interesting minor thread of the catalogue's argument: not, as one might expect, the emotion of the Jewish victims of dispossession (perhaps because their emotions were not recorded during the persecution; perhaps because it was felt they would have a distracting sentimentalizing effect), but rather the emotion of the non-Jewish German majority. In their introduction, Bertz and Dorrmann speak of the resentment aroused by restitution among the majority population. They express concern that cases such as the restitution of *Berliner Straßenszene* by Ernst Ludwig Kirchner in 2006 may revive a latent anti-Semitic notion that the *Kulturnation* is a more trustworthy custodian of art treasures than Jewish owners, for whom an art object supposedly has only commercial value. The Kirchner case, which becomes something of a leitmotiv in the catalogue, was clearly fresh enough in public memory at this time for the editors not to feel the need to spell out the story's ending: the sale of *Berliner Straßenszene* for over 30 million dollars. In one of ten interviews with professionals involved in restitution cases, the editors speak of the 'great emotionalism' that the case aroused in Germany; the interviewees are asked, directly or indirectly, what they think about the owners of restituted objects selling them on the open market, whether the descendants and their lawyers are only interested in money, or whether the descendants can really claim a link to the victims if they are only distant relatives. By taking seriously feelings of anger and loss felt by many in the non-Jewish majority as art works disappear from public possession and public view in Germany, the two Jewish museums that mounted *Raub und Restitution* evidently hope to guide public discussion towards a more reasoned understanding of the inevitable conflicts of feeling involved. Accordingly, the interviewees

generally counter the popular emotional responses in reasoned tones, citing legal, moral, and pragmatic arguments while also acknowledging the irreconcilability of opposing claims.

It would be misleading, however, to suggest that the two Jewish museums are attempting to close down the arguments by asking leading questions of their interviewees. In fact, the responses are unpredictable. Art dealer and auctioneer Henrik Hanstein expresses irritation at the way in which descendants fight for artworks only to then sell them, rather than valuing them as objects that had belonged to their parents and grandparents. This behaviour, he claims 'creates an atmosphere that is, in my view, not entirely conducive to solving the problem as a whole' (p. 55). Leo Hepner, a descendant who was able to retrieve a portrait of his grandfather and now accords it pride of place in his home, criticizes those who sell their restituted objects immediately, arguing that the objects should stay in the family for at least one generation before their owners are allowed to sell them. Interestingly, he regrets in particular that descendants have no emotional ties to the objects: 'Often the families do not even like the art, they feel no affinity with it. But we are talking about pictures that were collected by people who loved them, derived pleasure from them' (p. 111). One might counter that the lack of an emotional bond to the possessions of an older generation may be precisely a logical consequence of traumatic displacement, separation, and untimely bereavement; but the key point here is that by using the non-academic interview format the exhibition-makers leave the points of friction unresolved. At the same time, Leo Hepner's story, which is also dealt with in the final case history, may be said to offer the reader something of an emotional resolution in as much as he is a rare counter-example of a descendant who, rather than selling a painting that was restituted to him, paid for it, taking a pragmatic view that since he would have difficulty proving the details of his mother's claim to it, it made more sense to come to an arrangement with its owner.

The catalogue for the Viennese exhibition *Recollecting* has a similarly layered structure to its German counterpart, with different categories of information and commentary interleaved rather than being presented in blocks. Twenty case studies of theft or forced sale, picked out in red on the contents page, are interspersed between images and accounts of thirteen artworks (twelve of them commis-

## Review Article

sioned for the exhibition), while fourteen academic essays provide a commentary on the issues raised by the exhibition. Like the German exhibition, *Recollecting* moves beyond the cliché of the spectacular stolen painting (though paintings are well represented) to encompass stolen books, enamel buttons, and even a car, while one essay, by Miriam Triendl-Zadoff and Niko Wahl, reminds us of the everyday objects such as sheets and cutlery that have largely become unidentifiable as 'aryanized' objects despite making up the majority of stolen goods. Compared with the German exhibition, the Austrian one shifts the emphasis from history to memory and – though this is by no means a given in Memory Studies – to emotions. In her introduction, the editor and curator Alexandra Reininghaus states explicitly that her aim was to explore the emotional legacies of the thefts, not for the original owner, but for the descendants: 'The main focus was . . . on the subjective and emotional significance of the restitution of artworks and everyday objects to the descendants of their former owners' (p. 11). The exhibition appears to have engaged with these emotions in two ways: by documenting interviews with owners or descendants through videos or quotations; and by inviting artists to approach the topic subjectively. Whether the artworks are really emotional or rather cerebral, criticizing Austria's inadequate reparations (too little too late, as one piece has it), is difficult to tell from the catalogue, but some involve an encounter and dialogue with descendants. Nevertheless, in the catalogue at least, the emotional component emerges more clearly from the written contributions.

Harald Welzer argues that objects have a 'mnemonic energy', but sees this as a double-edged sword: objects from the past can not only help fulfil an intention and desire to remember, but can also 'ambush' and 'burden' people. For Aleida Assmann, the objects with which we surround ourselves are not dead, that is, solely material, but rather 'the pulsing periphery of our person, intimate and alive in equal measure' (p. 149). Perhaps the most interesting contribution in this context is by historian Nicole L. Immler. She points out that – contrary to the impression created by this exhibition and its German counterpart – the restitution of objects is a rare exception and that the much more common 'solution' to cases of loss of property or of life chances is the award of financial compensation. She summarizes her work interviewing survivors and descendants about what financial compensation has meant to them. Although she records positive

examples in which compensation claims help families to re-activate family stories or to open up inter-generational dialogue, her examples are less up-beat and more complex than those in the *Raub und Restitution* catalogue. A cruel husband shows unwonted sympathy for his wife by supporting her compensation application, for instance. Some victims find it difficult to admit the need for compensation because it means revising the positive survival narrative they have constructed for themselves. And for one second-generation interviewee, applications for compensation payments are an opportunity to confront her mother over what she sees as the emotional scars that her mother inflicted on her as a child.

Although for the most part the focus is on the experiences of the survivors and descendants, Rudolf de Cillia and Ruth Wodak report on a research project which investigated, amongst other things, the attitudes of majority Austrians towards restitution. Outlining the results of a series of group discussions about restitution held in 1995 and then again in 2006, they show that opinions about restitution often follow a 'Yes, but . . .' model, in which the necessity of making reparations is acknowledged in principle, but financial compensation is rejected as unnecessary or unfair. Not surprisingly, Austria's counterpart to the restitution of Kirchner's *Berliner Straßenszene*, the case of Klimt's portrait *Adele Bloch-Bauer I*, plays a role in the exhibition. Perhaps precisely because the public emotions at its 'loss' (that is, its return to the exiled surviving descendant of its former owner) were much stronger than in the case of the Kirchner painting, it is not allowed to dominate here. Ferdinand Bloch-Bauer appears as one case study among many, but with the focus on his porcelain collection (some of which had been unjustly acquired by the MAK). Nevertheless, artist Ines Doujak tackles the subject head-on in her installation *Adele* (2008). A plain petticoat hangs discarded on a chair, surrounded by piles of postcards stamped with the words 'Ade, Adele'. These recall the posters distributed around Vienna in the months before the painting left Austria, whose slogan 'Ciao, Adele' encouraged the Viennese to take one last look at the painting. In this way, Doujak evokes the arguably manufactured 'mourning' for the painting in 2006. Whereas the exhibition makers of *Raub und Restitution* are prepared to engage with such public feelings, Doujak appears to reject their sentimentality outright: the postcards show 'Adele' not in Klimt's fabulous patterned dress and cloak but in the

## Review Article

flesh-coloured slip and black boots, sitting prosaically on an office chair, while in an accompanying collage Adele's body is placed in an uncomfortable dialogue with the body of Emmy Göring.

Both catalogues are richly illustrated. Apart from images of the stolen objects and their original owners, *Raub und Restitution* contains intriguing images of documents unlikely to be known from elsewhere, such as the 1951 cartoon from a Jewish magazine entitled 'Mensch, ärgere dich nicht über die Wiedergutmachung!' (p. 33) or the 1955 Pan Am advert assuring customers travelling to Germany for their restitution claims that they will be served kosher food on board their flight (p. 255). *Recollecting* has the inestimable advantage over its German counterpart of showing images of the exhibition space. Between the commissioned artworks (mostly installations of one kind or another), stolen objects (or in some cases reproductions of them) are presented in display cases that imitate archive shelves, surrounded by contextualizing information. This draws attention away from their art or curiosity value and towards the process by which they were incorporated into museums and archives after 1945. The *Recollecting* catalogue also contains a series of photographs by Rainer Granahl showing some of the stolen objects in the spaces that currently house them: sometimes in museum storage facilities, far from their original domestic setting, sometimes restored to a very personal domestic setting—above a writing desk, on a bookshelf among post-war paperbacks—after years unjustly sequestered in a museum or archive. This implied movement between the home and the museum and back again is also a visual and conceptual motif in several of the commissioned artworks.

Although the academic work that will advance our knowledge of theft and restitution is likely to continue to be carried on outside the exhibition room and inside universities, these catalogues do more than simply draw this subject to the attention of a non-academic audience in a popular form. They attempt to bring different academic, professional, artistic, and public discourses into contact with one another, and *Recollecting*, in particular, acknowledges—more than previous Austrian exhibitions on the topic—the centrality of the emotional dimension in the loss of personal property and the fight for its return.



*Objects and Emotions Exhibited*

CHLOE PAVER is Senior Lecturer in German in the College of Humanities at the University of Exeter and is undertaking the first wide-ranging investigation of historical exhibitions about the National Socialist era, the GDR, and their legacies. Her many publications include *Refractions of the Third Reich in German and Austrian Fiction and Film* (2007) and *Memorialization in Germany since 1945* (2010, co-edited with Bill Niven).

## BOOK REVIEWS

FRANK REXROTH (ed.), *Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte der Gelehrten im späten Mittelalter, Vorträge und Forschungen, 73* (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2010), 343 pp. ISBN 978 3 7995 6873 9. €54.00

As Klaus van Eickels warns in his conclusion to this excellent and highly stimulating volume, there is always a danger of narcissism for academic historians writing about university history. This has not deterred generations of historians from tackling the subject, nor does it undermine the findings of this volume in any way, although it does lend a particularly interesting reflexive dimension to such writing. Traditionally, the historiography of medieval universities has tended to focus on the institutional dimensions of the development of higher education, or on the history of ideas in its intellectual sense. More recently, however, historians have turned to the social history of universities, investigating the social origins of their students and masters, the role universities played in wider society, and attitudes towards student misbehaviour and student power (an interest which actually dates back to the events of 1968). Two more recent projects, a network on medieval universities based at the University of Göttingen, and a joint project led by the universities of Ghent and Helsinki, exemplify this trend, and examine the interrelationships between the social configurations of universities and their cultural manifestations.

Herein lies the special appeal of this book, interrogating, as it does, what we mean by 'learned culture'. Rather than treat 'cultural history' in a vacuum, the volume examines the reciprocal relationship between this distinctive culture and its institutional and intellectual setting. And, perhaps most usefully, the volume never takes it for granted that such a culture existed, but rather examines ways in which it could be self-consciously constructed, as well as its myriad variations between different individuals, universities, regions, and so on. The essays ask how universities fitted into the wider world and interacted with their socio-economic and political contexts; what effects the special status of universities had on the individuals who

worked within them; and how a distinctively intellectual culture operated as a kind of cultural capital, *à la* Bourdieu. All this is summed up by Frank Rexroth's introductory question of whether a distinctive *Gelehrtenkultur* existed. More than this, though, the book takes on the challenge of thinking about the self-perception of intellectuals, asking whether they saw themselves as distinctive, and how this self-perception inevitably interacted with the labels imposed on them by others. The relationship between self-definition and externally imposed labels is bound to be a reciprocal one into which recent sociology has provided us with a variety of useful insights but which deserves further exploration.

Accordingly, the essays are explicit about their use of source material which often tells us more about the *representation* of intellectuals than about their actual preoccupations, and it is praiseworthy that all the contributions remain alert to the methodological difficulties implicit in this observation. If we are always dependent upon representations and stereotypes, how can we distinguish the effects of such labels? The collection of ten essays (not counting the very helpful introduction and conclusion by Rexroth and van Eickels respectively) addresses these broader questions from a variety of substantive and disciplinary angles, from the analysis of courtly literature by Klaus Ridder to the art historical approach of Andrea von Hülsen-Esch, the largely prosopographical approach of Wolfgang Eric Wagner, and the anthropologically informed account by Marian Füssel.

Many of the essays consider the question of intellectual culture by assessing the importance of networks of intellectuals in this period. In doing so, they draw implicitly on some of the ideas put forward by recent methodological developments in *histoire croisée* or *Verflechtungsgeschichte* with its focus on multiple modes and directions of exchange.<sup>1</sup> This proves to be a productive way of thinking about the relationship between identity as self-constructed, and identity as

<sup>1</sup> Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, 'Beyond Comparison: *Histoire Croisée* and the Challenge of Reflexivity', *History and Theory*, 45 (2006), 30–50; Shalini Randeria, 'Geteilte Geschichte und verwobene Moderne', in Jörn Rüsen, Hanna Leitgeb, and Norbert Jegelka (eds.), *Zukunftsentwürfe: Ideen für eine Kultur der Veränderung* (Frankfurt am Main, 2000), 87–96; Jürgen Osterhammel, 'Transnationale Gesellschaftsgeschichte: Erweiterung oder Alternative?', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 27 (2001), 464–79.

## Book Reviews

dependent upon being seen to be part of a distinctive group. Nevertheless, the essays maintain a critical awareness of the contrasts between different universities (see especially van Eickels and Thomas Wetzstein) and networks are shown to have operated as much at individual and personal level as at institutional level. It is the interface between the two which forms the focus of Rainer Christoph Schwinges' examination of 'dynasties' of intellectuals in the later Middle Ages, providing useful insights into the role of personal preference and patterns of patronage. The question of celibacy occurs several times in the volume, and the increasing frequency of marriage amongst university men provides a new angle on networks, as Gadi Algazi demonstrates how the new families of these men could be used to shore up or develop networks themselves. The analysis here is helpfully sharpened by the introduction of a comparative dimension with Jewish and Muslim intellectuals.

These networks clearly brought with them a degree of social cachet, and the social status of intellectuals provides another recurrent theme, one treated with particular subtlety by Ridder in his essay. The relationship between a peculiarly intellectual form of status and the way in which this was mapped onto broader ideas of social hierarchy is explored here. Ridder demonstrates that knowledge was increasingly conceived of in terms which privileged its connections with a certain nobility of mind. Attention is also given to the precise mechanisms by which this status could be sustained and concretized, and the focus on rituals and their transformative potential by Füssel is particularly welcome in this respect. Alert to recent anthropological thinking on the value of rituals, he helpfully distinguishes them from mere ceremonial, and indicates the ways in which they could be used apparently to set intellectuals apart from the rest of society, but also, and perhaps more importantly, to mark out different ranks *within* the universities and transitions between those different levels. Rituals provide fertile ground for such analysis, dependent as they are on an audience able to seize upon shared meanings and conventions, and since they serve not only to consolidate hierarchies, but to exacerbate or visualize conflict. Von Hülsen-Esch's examination of manuscript depictions of students and intellectuals furthers the analysis by demonstrating the reliance of this particular group identity on distinctive clothing, which again depended on the shared knowledge of a code of visual representation by

those who viewed both the manuscripts and the academics who dressed thus (the plates are very welcome here, though colour would have been useful given the evident importance of different coloured cloth).

Close attention to the subtle gradations of clothing worn by intellectuals indicates the extent to which these men were able to set themselves apart, but likewise draws attention to the minute distinctions which they made. These ensured that this was not an egalitarian community of knowledge, but a deeply stratified and hierarchical community. Indeed, whether discussed from the angle of patterns of patronage, family ties, rituals, or physical appearance, it is clear that these were networks not of equals, but of deliberately unequal relationships in which status was never a given, but something to be continually struggled for and negotiated. Moreover, the focus on representation in the contributions by Füssel and von Hülsen-Esch enables them to underline the complex relationship between the ways in which academics were represented, and their choices of self-representation. This is an aspect which deserves further exploration since labels were clearly consciously manipulated by their subjects, whether simply to be rejected, or in order to be more subtly exploited. The centrality of status to the construction of these networks focuses attention upon the cultural capital on which status depended, and, again, the strength of these essays lies in their refusal simply to take that cultural capital for granted. Jacques Verger's article provides an insight into the mechanisms by which capital could be generated by examining the books owned by notable intellectuals. He discovers a quasi-fetishization of books as physical objects: to own a certain number of books seems in itself to have been indicative of intellectual status and certainly gave one the appearance of profound scholarship. Harald Müller's consideration of the habitus of the Humanists provides another angle on the ways in which cultural capital could be generated through the practice of learning.

The essays repeatedly stress that this learned culture operated within an intellectual sphere, but also interacted with wider social forces, and defined itself in the context of those external currents. It is therefore useful to consider the relationship between learned culture and religious context, for example. Dorothea Weltecke points out that knowledge had always been regarded with ambivalence by religious authorities: it was clearly a key part of a religious outlook,

## Book Reviews

and yet could be so self-perpetuating as to invoke the suspicion of those focused on piety and devotion for their own sakes. And, of course, in an institutional context, what might be termed the privatization of knowledge was extremely problematic from a religious perspective which argued that all knowledge was a gift from God. The question of celibacy of university scholars helps to illuminate this question, and in independent treatments by Algazi and Wolfgang Eric Wagner, the gradual erosion of the ideal of celibacy provides an opportunity to consider the relationship between religious life and precepts and the life of scholarship. Algazi's comparison with Jewish and Muslim practice proves extremely illuminating in this respect, and highlights the very complex relationship between the monkish life from which university conventions are so often assumed to have derived and practices within universities. In examining the practical effects of marriage on timetabling within universities, fees and salaries, communal living, and so on, both historians are able to demonstrate that, whilst there was a clear rationale to scholarly celibacy, a functionalist explanation should not be assumed. Rather, the answer lies in the self-perception of a community anxious to assert itself as distinctive.

Examination of the interaction between scholarly cultures and wider social trends also allows the volume to avoid giving the impression that universities or centres of learning were ivory towers, anxious to avoid contact with the real world. Particularly informative in this respect is the contribution by Thomas Wetzstein, who examines the case of medieval jurists, a group whose expertise was generated specifically to respond to shifting political circumstances whether in the ecclesiastical or secular world. Indeed, some much broader questions are raised here about shifting political circumstances in later medieval Europe, which meant that there was a greater need for various kinds of intellectual expertise. The question of whether the notion of experts as such emerged in the later Middle Ages provides food for further thought, and certainly indicates a vein of research for the integration of universities into the practical political needs of the period.

This indication of shifting needs, and the ways in which intellectuals could respond to them, is another strength of the volume. Rather than treating the later Middle Ages as a homogenous period, the essays address head-on the transitional nature of this period. The

importance of Humanism is repeatedly stressed, and the very different kind of intellectual identity assumed by this group is analysed. The relationship between learning and religion in particular is shown to have shifted, partly with the underplaying of the religious dimension by later Humanists (see Weltecke in particular), and the rather ambivalent relationship between Humanists and their immediate scholarly predecessors examined by Müller. The mechanisms through which knowledge was valued are shown by Verger to have operated very differently, as he compares the mendicants' suspicion of possessing too many books (or at least very problematic relationship with the materiality of books) with the Humanists' adoration of the physical objects. Even attitudes towards ritual are shown by Füssel to have changed, as the embracing of ritual display in the earlier part of the period became increasingly problematic and ambivalent in the later part, partly owing to Humanist critique.

Medieval intellectuals, and their primary home—the universities—emerge, then, from this volume, as profoundly concerned by their own identity and anxious to engage with a whole gamut of mechanisms by which it could be affirmed and manipulated. They are shown to have been alert to the ways in which they were represented by others, and sophisticated in their manipulation of those labels. But they do not emerge as idealized sites of some sort of egalitarian pursuit of knowledge and social mobility: rather, these were clearly identities predicated on increasingly stratified hierarchies, where conflict (and certainly repeated negotiation and adaptation) rather than consensus was often characteristic. In a period when historians in the UK are being increasingly encouraged to think about cooperation and consensus (see the latest thematic strands proposed by the AHRC), university networks would seem like a perfect topic; and yet this volume demonstrates that networks could be sites of debate and struggle. Nevertheless, all the essays *do* optimistically stress that learning itself was clearly valued, and for its own sake.

HANNAH SKODA is Fellow and Tutor at St John's College, University of Oxford. Her book on violence in later medieval France is forthcoming, and she is currently embarking on research on misbehaving students in the fifteenth century.

THOMAS BROCKMANN, *Dynastie, Kaiseramt und Konfession: Politik und Ordnungsvorstellungen Ferdinands II. im Dreißigjährigen Krieg*, Quellen und Forschungen aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte, NS 25 (Paderborn: Schönigh, 2011), 518 pp. ISBN 978 3 506 76727 1. €64.00

Ferdinand II is one of the most important figures in Central European history. His reign as Habsburg monarch and Holy Roman emperor (1619–37) coincided with the outbreak of the Thirty Years War; a conflict he did much to shape and prolong and which posed an existential crisis for his dynasty and faith. Perhaps given the complexity of these events, few historians have tackled even specific aspects, still less a full biography. Our view remains distorted by that of his enemies, who depicted him as a bigoted tyrant seeking an illegal ‘universal monarchy’ in alliance with his Spanish cousins. We are still waiting for a satisfactory biography, but Thomas Brockmann’s 2006 *Habilitation* at last provides a sophisticated and detailed analysis of Ferdinand’s motives and policies.

Brockmann’s overall argument is clear and well founded. Ferdinand constantly struggled to reconcile two potentially conflicting aims, both before his succession and subsequently. His first priority was to surmount the crisis posed by the Bohemian revolt beginning with the Defenestration of Prague in May 1618. At its heart, this meant stabilizing Habsburg rule weakened by two decades of costly war against the Turks and internecine succession struggles which left the dynasty bankrupt and vulnerable to pressure from the nobles in its many kingdoms and provinces. This situation suggested Ferdinand should neutralize the immediate threat and prevent the revolt from spreading. Yet the revolt also represented an opportunity for what Brockmann repeatedly calls a ‘roll back’ of gains previously made by Habsburg opponents, both in the hereditary lands and the Empire as a whole. Success depended on striking the right balance between securing stability and capitalizing on opportunity. Ferdinand wanted to improve his position relative to his opponents, but needed to avoid fuelling further conflicts he lacked the means to fight. As Brockmann shows, Ferdinand consistently narrowly misjudged the balance, always leaving just enough fires burning to reignite the war in the Empire.

Brockmann’s most important point emerges from his analysis of this dilemma. Ferdinand relied on his formal position as Habsburg



monarch and, after August 1619, as emperor to compensate for his inability to raise the resources needed to secure his aims by force alone. This places constitutional rights and their interpretation at the heart of the story, and goes a long way to explaining why all parties to the conflict related their policies to the imperial constitution and its various charters like the Peace of Augsburg of 1555. Perhaps more than for most early modern rulers, Ferdinand's authority depended on a façade of power sustained by the mantle of legitimacy. Brockmann's detailed analysis shows Ferdinand's overriding concern to stay within what he regarded as the correct interpretation of his constitutional powers, even if this meant foregoing desirable political opportunities presented by military victories. Religion fitted into this framework, rather than dominating it. Ferdinand exemplified the 'Catholic mainstream' (pp. 454-5) view of faith and policy. His outlook was decidedly Catholic and he did not see his imperial role as impartial mediator between the rival confessions. However, he rejected Providentialist thinking and was not prepared to be guided by theologians alone.

The analysis proceeds chronologically from the outbreak of the Bohemian revolt to the conclusion of the electoral congress at Regensburg in November 1630. Brockmann argues forcefully that Ferdinand did not thwart Matthias's efforts to defuse the Bohemian revolt through mediation, demonstrating that no one in Vienna believed the situation could be ended just by talking. The Bohemian crisis influenced how Ferdinand dealt with each subsequent problem. He strove to minimize the impression that his policies were dictated by religion, arguing instead that his opponents had wilfully misunderstood their constitutional rights. He did not hesitate to use force against them, but the scale and rapidity of his response was constrained both by inadequate fiscal and military means, and by the desire not to antagonize the Protestant German princes and other European powers. In contrast to enemies such as Frederick V of the Palatinate, Ferdinand remained pragmatic and made significant concessions to win allies or neutralize additional threats, such as that posed by the largely Protestant nobility in Hungary.

In an important corrective to the received view, Brockmann argues that Ferdinand did not seek to widen the conflict during the 1620s. Whether the real motor for such action was Bavaria is perhaps questionable, given that Dieter Albrecht and Michael Kaiser have

## Book Reviews

emphasized how Duke Maximilian consistently waited for imperial sanction before committing himself, as well as opposing anything which might merge the Empire's troubles with Spain's various European conflicts. Nonetheless, Brockmann convincingly demonstrates Ferdinand's reluctance to use his early victories over Denmark in 1625–6 to recover the north German bishoprics which had been occupied by Lutheran princes since 1555. As the successes continued into 1627, both Ferdinand and Maximilian resolved independently to proceed to full restitution. Even then, the emperor remained concerned that he lacked sufficient legal basis for such an action. The genesis of the fatal Edict of Restitution is covered at considerable length, indicating that Ferdinand had to present it as a judicial verdict to avoid the impression that he was exceeding his constitutional powers by unilaterally rewriting the Peace of Augsburg.

Bavaria undoubtedly pushed Ferdinand into making the Edict a more stridently Catholic statement than he initially intended. Elsewhere, the emperor's policies ran counter to Bavarian desires, especially the plan to establish a permanent imperial naval and military presence in northern Germany in alliance with Spain. Whereas this followed temporary overconfidence, Ferdinand's intervention in northern Italy in 1628 was forced on him by Spain's precipitous action to impose a solution to the Mantuan succession crisis. The detailed discussion of this problem, together with the electoral congress which opened in Regensburg, underpins Brockmann's argument that Ferdinand's focus remained on the Empire and his hereditary lands. Intervention in Italy was dictated by his desire to uphold imperial rights there. He was quite prepared to incur Spain's displeasure if it enabled him to settle the Mantuan question and secure peace with France. Likewise, Ferdinand accepted the need to readjust the balance between him and the electors at Regensburg as the price of maintaining his authority as legitimate ruler. The importance attached by all participants to constitutional rights is revealed by Brockmann's analysis of Wallenstein's dismissal and the reform of the imperial army. Ferdinand had to sacrifice his plan to secure his son's election as successor in order to maintain the legitimacy of his own rule which required the participation of the electors and other imperial Estates. Yet constitutional propriety could work to his advantage. Bavaria was obliged to drop part of its programme because it tacitly accepted Ferdinand's arguments that its own polit-

ical and military autonomy lacked convincing foundation within imperial law.

There are further, more detailed insights on specific questions too numerous to cover here. However, some relatively important aspects of Ferdinand's policies are curiously absent. There is no discussion of Ferdinand's frequent pardons of prominent opponents, such as Christian of Anhalt, which drew considerable contemporary criticism, yet were clearly an important strategy and related to his sense of his position as emperor. Likewise, the lands and titles distributed at Regensburg in 1623 to Habsburg loyalists and other supporters are also omitted, though Brockmann does discuss Bavaria's acquisition of the electoral title and stresses how such rewards helped compensate for fiscal-military inadequacy. The role of advisors, such as Ferdinand's confessor Lamormaini, is covered with Brockmann concluding that, on all important questions, Ferdinand took the final decision himself. Nonetheless, the process of policy-making remains rather colourless and impersonal, as does the depiction of Ferdinand himself. The text is driven by an exhaustive analysis of memoranda and correspondence drawn from fourteen archives and backed by impressive reading of the secondary sources. While this establishes when and why key decisions were taken, it does not say much about the people involved or what it meant to them. Rather more fundamental is the exclusion of events before 1618 and after 1630. Ferdinand's policy after 1618 was clearly shaped by his previous experience as Archduke of Styria where his actions were already guided by the narrow legalism characterizing his rule as emperor. The decision to stop in 1630 does allow Brockmann to show how precarious Ferdinand's position remained despite the almost unbroken run of military success since 1620. However, it means we still lack proper coverage of his response to the Swedish invasion, Saxony's defection in 1631, and the flawed Peace of Prague which he bequeathed to his son and successor, Ferdinand III.

PETER H. WILSON is G. F. Grant Professor of History and History Director of Research at the University of Hull. His book *Europe's Tragedy: The Thirty Years War* won the Society for Military History's Distinguished Book Award in 2011. He is currently writing a general history of the Holy Roman Empire for Penguin and Harvard University Press.

ANDREW C. THOMPSON, *George II: King and Elector*, Yale English Monarchs Series (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011), xii + 315 pp. ISBN 978 0 300 11892 6. £25.00 \$40.00

Although George II's reign (1727–60) was longer than that of any previous monarch in British history since Elizabeth I, he has not, so far, received much academic attention. It is only recently that some scholars have worked on a general reassessment of the Georgian monarchy.<sup>1</sup> The present book by Andrew C. Thompson, who has already demonstrated his expertise on British–Hanoverian relations,<sup>2</sup> is in line with these recent trends in the historiography of eighteenth-century Britain. The author is well prepared for such a task by virtue not only of his earlier book, but also of his impressive reading of German sources and secondary works, which is vital to any attempt of this sort. As he points out, much of the surviving archival material is preserved in the state archives in Hanover (pp. 2–3).

Thompson's interest is clearly focused on the field of (foreign) policy, but this book is not a narrow political biography in the classical sense. Although it has a political focus, it offers a full description of George's life from his birth in Hanover in 1683 to his death in 1760. It provides a well-written account of political conditions in Britain, Hanover, and Europe, and the various stations of George's life as electoral prince, Prince of Wales, Elector of Hanover, and King of Great Britain. It includes chapters on family and court life, and on tensions within the Hanoverian dynasty. Sometimes these insights into familial matters become somewhat lengthy, especially when they relate to mistresses and love affairs which tend to be anecdotal.

Yet Thompson demonstrates – and this is surely the strength of this book – the crucial role of the monarchy in eighteenth-century Britain. George II is depicted as an active monarch who worked hard to achieve his political aims. Thompson shows the monarch as a politician with firm control over most aspects of his own policies, especially in foreign affairs, where he was much more expert even than Robert Walpole, his prime minister. He also adjusted, as the author points out, to a variety of roles. For example, he was able to

<sup>1</sup> e.g. Hannah Smith, *Georgian Monarchy: Politics and Culture, 1714–1760* (Cambridge, 2006); Jeremy Black, *George II: Puppet of the Politicians?* (Exeter, 2007).

<sup>2</sup> Andrew C. Thompson, *Britain, Hanover and the Protestant Interest, 1688–1756* (Woodbridge, 2006).

take on the persona of a *Landesvater* in Hanover and to conform to the totally different political system in Britain.

The book begins with an overview of the political events and processes that led to the Hanoverian succession. By the time of his father's coronation, George was already an electoral prince with political and military experience. In London, however, he was a 'king-in-waiting'. This and his connections with opposition groups during the 'Whig split' led to growing tensions with his father and to the separation of his household from the court. Thompson thoroughly analyses the conflict between George and his father, which was later repeated in the tensions between George and his own eldest son, Frederick. It is interesting (although already well known) to note that in both cases the political opposition centred on the respective Prince of Wales and his household, thereby creating a rival court. On his own accession, George was willing to replace some of the leading figures in the government, but in the end Walpole was successful in winning the trust of the new king, thus providing some kind of continuity. George's reign was dominated by the escalating conflict with Spain over the American colonies and growing tensions in Europe, especially over the Habsburg succession. The king's personal involvement in the battle of Dettingen (1743) was exploited by the government as a great victory won by George himself but, as Thompson shows, even this could not silence the opposition. Internal affairs were the other great theme of George's reign. Thompson dedicates large parts of his book to politics and the British political system, showing George's struggles with the opposition, which rallied to the household of Frederick Prince of Wales, and his engagement in foreign affairs. Problems with Spain, growing tensions with Austria leading to the *renversement des alliances* in 1756, and the Jacobite rebellion of 1745 are the subjects of the concluding chapters.

What is clearly demonstrated is that George II was by no means a weak monarch governed by his ministers, wife, and mistresses. Thompson criticizes this traditional narrative which, in his view, is part of a 'Whiggish' account founded on the idea of a developing ministerial executive becoming more and more independent of the Crown. This view, he suggests, overstates the role of the first prime minister, Robert Walpole, while that of the monarch is played down (p. 3). Thomson, however, establishes a different perspective on the relationship between George and his ministers, which also leads him

## Book Reviews

to reassess the development of the executive, and especially the evolution of the cabinet as the main executive organ of government. Recent studies of British government in the eighteenth century have stressed the Glorious Revolution as the most important turning point in its development. From that time on, the traditional narrative claimed, Britain rapidly became a constitutional monarchy in which the monarch ceased to be the centre of political decision-making. Thompson, by contrast, argues that the most important changes occurred during the reign of George II, not because the monarch was weak, but because he took an active part in planning and implementing foreign policy. This meant that the monarch had to be in touch with his secretaries of state and other leading ministers, even during his frequent trips to his Hanoverian territories. A system of government able to execute the will of the king in his absence and the ability to keep up communications were therefore of vital importance (pp. 214–19).

Apart from international affairs and relations with Hanover, the second great theme of George's reign was his conflict with his eldest son, which is discussed several times in the book (for example, pp. 119–22). Frederick had been left in Hanover when George went to Britain in 1714, and the new Prince of Wales was taken to London only after the death of his grandfather. He thus grew up alienated from his parents. His increasing financial problems along with a rather small allowance led him to contact members of the opposition to seek parliamentary support against his father. His early death in 1751, however, left the opposition without a centre and caused George to make arrangements for a regency in case of his own demise during his grandson's minority (pp. 207–14).

Although George, in Thompson's account, was not governed by his wife or his mistresses, the position of Queen Caroline and, after the queen's death in 1737, of Lady Yarmouth, George's mistress brought over from Hanover, is by no means neglected. During her life, Caroline played many important roles. At first, while Princess of Wales, she had an important part in court life and ceremony because of the absence of a queen. Later she took on many aspects of politics in which George was less interested, for example, governing the Church of England (pp. 106–7). Thompson takes the affection between George and his consort seriously, thereby questioning the view that the king was emotionally cold (pp. 122–6).

*George II: King and Elector*

It is perhaps a weakness of biography as a genre that important developments in structures and systems have to be embedded in the chronological pattern of a personal life story. Thompson, however, manages to revise our view of crucial aspects of the British governmental system via the king's biography, for example, the development of the cabinet. Moreover, the typical problems of biographies are at least partly compensated for by an index that includes not only names and places, but also key terms. On the whole, Thompson's book is a well-written, full-scale biography of a largely underestimated king. It offers profound insights into the political system of the Hanoverian monarchy, and a plausible and well-argued reassessment of Britain's Hanoverian king, based on a wide range of source material from Britain and Germany. Thompson comes to the conclusion that Britain in 1760 was very different from Britain in 1727 or 1714, and that this change was in large measure due to the monarch himself.

ULRICH NIGGEMANN teaches early modern history at the University of Marburg. He specializes in the history of confessional minorities and migration, the representation of power, and the history of political ideas. Among his publications are *Immigrationspolitik zwischen Konflikt und Konsens: Die Hugenottenansiedlung in Deutschland und England (1681–1697)* (2008) and most recently (ed. with Kai Ruffing) *Antike als Modell in Nordamerika? Konstruktion und Verargumentierung, 1763–1809* (2011). Currently he is preparing a study of the memory of the Glorious Revolution in eighteenth-century Britain.

BENNO GAMMERL, *Untertanen, Staatsbürger und Andere: Der Umgang mit ethnischer Heterogenität im Britischen Weltreich und im Habsburgerreich 1867–1918*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 189 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 400 pp. ISBN 978 3 525 37011 7. €57.00

This is a pioneering study, but a good deal narrower than its title might seem to suggest. It treats largely of official *Umgang* with ‘subjects’ and ‘citizens’ in the juridical sense, particularly with specific groups of them, in the British and Habsburg empires. Comparison of these two polities is suddenly coming into vogue, but still distinctly underdetermined in research terms. Thus Gammerl’s perspectives are refreshing, but rather circumscribed; highly suggestive, but carrying limited explanatory power.

Gammerl presents three case studies, each juxtaposing territories from the two empires and exploring different interactive themes. The first set is Canada and Hungary, as a couple of ‘dominions’, both defined in constitutional respects by legislation of the same year, 1867, which had secured them a large measure of home rule. Alike these countries witnessed an increasingly ethnic interpretation of citizenship and a drive within their own boundaries for more integral allegiances, what the author engagingly identifies as ‘staatsbürger-schaftsrechtliche Binnenhomogenisierungsprozesse’.

The second pairing, of Austria (in its Cisleithanian sense) and India, gives rise to a more extended comparison. Both these polities sought to implement top-down state-based criteria for citizenship, and to resist bottom-up ethnic-based demands. Yet each had to acknowledge the ethnic principle as its institutions of representative government emerged. In Austria this culminated in the so-called Moravian Compromise of 1905, which was paralleled in part for India by the Montagu–Chelmsford electoral reform of 1918–19. In the first case, national self-identification by the individual came to be replaced, or at least complemented, by objective rules; whereas India gradually moved to a proportional system for the protection of minorities. Austria evolved multiple linguistic categories as markers of ethnic difference, against the essentially binary system, European versus non-European, that developed in India. Austria’s elaborate rules for scrutiny are set against the say-so of local officials in India.



Thirdly, British East Africa and Bosnia-Herzegovina are compared—two territories which shared an uncertain status in their respective imperial systems. Bosnians, as residents of a land jointly administered by Austria and Hungary, were placed in a position inferior to that of other citizens of the Monarchy; East Africa was not deemed a full British colony, so its natives had no legal rights at all. Officials in Bosnia-Herzegovina tried to cultivate forms of non-ethnic identification, that is, loyalty to the province as a whole; but this was increasingly recognized as an abortive quest, so a complicated curial suffrage evolved. In East Africa an electoral system eventually came into being in 1919 that confirmed the absolute gulf between Europeans and natives, with Indian settlers grudgingly accorded a limited stake.

A final expository section, on the United Kingdom itself, shows how fluid were its ground-rules for citizenship. The statist-territorial principle tended to prevail, along with the *ius soli*. However, some ethnic criteria came to be added, especially to restrict the rights of Jewish immigrants. By now some of Gammerl's connecting themes have emerged clearly. Thus evidently East European Jews were a point of reference for administrators in both empires. More unexpectedly, we discover that both developed their regulations for dealing with protected persons abroad from experience of claimants living in the territories of the Ottomans.

Contrasts are more marked, notably the opposition between the *Untertanen* and the *Staatsbürger* in Gammerl's title. British 'subjects', he finds, lacked a foundation of explicit legal equality, against Austrian 'citizens', a notion which incorporated the entire weight of the Josephinist state reform initiated over a hundred years earlier. Yet it was the British Empire that grew more hierarchical and centralist, at least by the end of the nineteenth century. And it was there that a series of deep and irresolvable clashes emerged, as differences of class and religion came to be perceived more and more in ethnic terms. Gammerl concludes that institutional racism marked the British Empire, whereas it operated only unofficially (mainly as anti-Semitism) in Austria-Hungary.

This is difficult ground. Gammerl does not want to be simplistic, and some of the distinctions may be terminological (he tends to apply the word *rassisch* only in extra-European contexts anyway). But he has an important claim to make:

## Book Reviews

My findings clearly contradict received characterization of the British case as a shining example of liberality and of the Habsburg Empire as a *Völkerkerker* and bastion of authoritarian forms of rule . . . [T]he legal precepts which determined treatment of ethnic heterogeneity in the Austrian context, that is, neutrality and acknowledgement, rested neither on racial discrimination nor on ethnic exclusivity, and thus appear from today's perspective as it were more modern than the imperialistic logic decisive for the British case (pp. 317, 337).

Gammerl therefore sets himself firmly against recent commentators such as László Péter who, likewise constructing paradigms of a 'western' and an 'eastern' evolution, with Great Britain and Habsburg central Europe as their exemplars, have argued more or less the opposite. Of course, 'progress' can be a highly ambiguous concept: one case noted by Gammerl is how the mechanisms for extension of the suffrage to women might serve only to confirm ethnic prejudice.

There is a further large claim advanced through this book: that the years around 1900 were decisive, since they represented the beginning of the end for both—indeed all European—empires. The *Jahrhundertwende* inaugurated changes in attitude which, once espoused in the new arena of mass politics, would progressively undermine them. Gammerl links this above all to accelerating processes of migration and mobilization, which certainly tended both to promote ethnic identification and to subvert multinational states. The First World War, on this analysis, only exacerbated things further, though it would surely be unwise to underplay the significance of events in 1918–19, even for the British Empire.

What, we may wonder, were the criteria for Gammerl's choice of particular cases and comparisons? It might be thought that India, in its territorial and jurisdictional complexity, had more in common with the Old Reich than with Austria; or that Hungary, in its close proximity to the heartland, but its legal, cultural, and institutional distinctiveness from it, had more in common with Scotland or Ireland than with Canada. Evidently Gammerl has managed only a first sampling of attitudes within the *Weltreich* (even if India, indeed, always lay at the heart of them). And those attitudes were never uniform: he

himself points to some substantially divergent tendencies between subcontinent and dominions. The Habsburg Monarchy was a far smaller and, in global terms, simpler operation (it had, for instance, no equivalent to the Indian settlers in East Africa). There too, however, the categories employed can appear rough and ready. Whereas Gammerl recognizes a clear differentiation between Austria and Hungary for many salient purposes post-1867, there are also verdicts on 'Austria-Hungary' as a single entity that may at times elide this.

Gammerl does not offer us much insight into society as a whole, or into wider notions of nationality, beyond his world of legislation and administrative memoranda. It would have helped had he reflected more on the nature of the officialdoms involved in generating the evidence he has exploited, as individuals and as groups, along with their socio-cultural background and professional assumptions. One way in which he might have illuminated mental presuppositions would have been through some investigation of mutual perceptions, whether at the level of diplomatic contact or through the impressions of independent observers on one or other side of the fence, such as Henry Wickham Steed and Josef Redlich.

There is, however, already much to ponder in this careful and thoughtful study. Altogether Gammerl has followed some curious byways, as the primary sources dictated. *Inter alia* he investigates a Hungarian suffrage law which never became effective; protection for British nationals in Siam; the niceties of the status of Bosnians in other parts of the Monarchy; and obstacles to British naturalization that were rarely overcome, even for the United Kingdom (Karl Marx was refused on the ground that 'this man has not been loyal to his own King and Country', p. 226n.), let alone for East Africa, which admitted only one person in fifty years (p. 184). Such curiosities will hardly need to be revisited. The rest of the book, however, and its larger arguments, call out for critical evaluation. It is the great merit of Gammerl to have set some of the terms for real comparative analysis of his two empires.

R. J. W. EVANS is Regius Professor of History Emeritus at Oxford University. He has written extensively on the history of east-central Europe, his most recent book being *Austria, Hungary, and the Habsburgs: Central Europe, c.1683-1867* (2006). He is working on a history of modern Hungary, c.1750-1945.

NORBERT FRIEDRICH, UWE KAMINSKY, and ROLAND LÖFFLER (eds.), *The Social Dimension of Christian Missions in the Middle East: Historical Studies of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, Missionsgeschichtliches Archiv, Studien der Berliner Gesellschaft für Missionsgeschichte, 16 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010), 252 pp. ISBN 978 3 515 09656 0. €46.00

This collection of studies of nineteenth- and twentieth-century missions to the Middle East is a welcome addition to the field of missiological scholarship. It comprises a wide-ranging set of papers that consider the social dimension of Protestant and Catholic missions in the Middle East: what the blurb terms ‘the trademark’ of missions to Islam. The ‘social dimension’ refers to the educational, medical, social, and scientific work that was carried out by the missionary organizations. While it was not explicitly evangelistic it was deemed to be one of the most effective ways of teaching Christian beliefs and practices to non-believers. The various chapters trace the impact of the social dimension of missionary work on the communities and nations with which the missionary project was engaged – both the countries that sent them and the places to which they went. Palestine as a mission field has been described as ‘a market place of different groups looking for a presence in the Holy Land’. It is this marketplace of ideas, objectives, personalities, and institutions that is so deftly dealt with in this book. The book presents a feast of novel approaches and a number of the chapters begin by emphasizing the ‘newness’ of the topic addressed. Inter- or intra-denominational and national rivalries are highlighted in a number of contributions. There is repeated reference to the lack of ‘success’ in terms of conversions; this is presented as one of the distinguishing features of Middle East missions compared with other missionary milieus. The reader is called to go beyond the standard approaches to mission history and look at the same questions through different historiographical lenses. Underlying this is a challenge to consider how we *use* the study of mission.

This volume was published following an international conference on ‘The Social Dimension of Missions in the Orient’, which took place in Kaiserswerth, Düsseldorf in 2006. It comprises contributions by scholars who address the question from a number of different angles. Some focus on the reception of the missionary project by local popu-

lations; others tackle the impact of missions on the 'sending' country. Some papers examine inter- or intra-denominational disputes whilst others look at the question from the political angle. The papers are introduced by two overviews of the methodology and history of mission studies, which set the rest of the papers in context. Roland Löffler's chapter presents an introduction to the particular approach to mission studies found in this collection. Highlighting the rediscovery of mission history in its own right rather than as a by-product of imperial studies, anthropology, and social science, Löffler proposes that mission history itself has become a multi-disciplinary field of scholarship, an idea to which the diverse papers that follow testify. Löffler points to the 'new cultural approach' to history exemplified in these studies, which seek to examine practices, behaviour, and formative attitudes in a particular social group. His overview of German Protestant activities in Palestine in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries shows the extent to which they can be seen as part of the formation of German Protestantism more widely, as he draws out the effect of the development of independent faith-based Protestant institutions on the German Protestant experience in both Europe and Palestine. Löffler applies a combined methodology of the 'history of mentality' and 'milieu theory' to frame his discussion of the German Protestant experience and show that it was the social dimension of mission that formed the reality 'on the ground'.

Heleen Murre-van den Berg's treatment of the study of Western missions in the Middle East is an ideal *tour d'horizon* of the whole field of scholarship. Her expertise in the topic is generously shared with the reader both through her account of the history of the subject and her detailed bibliography of the study of missions. As well as furnishing us with an overview, Murre-van den Berg touches on some key issues in the development of the field, which frame the other contributions. She tackles the questions that many may be inclined to ask: why has mission studies enjoyed this resurgence, and why the Middle East? For Murre-van den Berg the answer lies in the way that the subject touches on so many other disciplines and, as Michael Marten argues in his paper, illuminates the questions and challenges faced today. The contribution that missions made to issues of modernity in the Middle East, and the political developments of the nineteenth century that we glean from them, are invaluable for understanding the geopolitical fluctuations of the region

## Book Reviews

today. Had our appetite for what follows not been sufficiently whetted, Murre-van den Berg underscores the newness of the specific approach that is presented in this book. Questions of reception and the impact of Middle East missionary work—both on the missionary country and its target population—have been largely overlooked, no doubt because of the lack of conversions compared with other parts of the world. But as Murre-van den Berg suggests and the rest of the book demonstrates, the ‘less tangible’ influences of the missionary purpose have much light to shed on our understanding of the subject as a whole.

Dominique Trimbur, Haim Goren, and Barbara Haider-Wilson address the question of Catholic activity in Palestine in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Trimbur traces the evidence of German and French scientific, cultural, and pedagogical values in the institutions of Palestine and Israel today back to the influence of Roman Catholic networks established in the middle of the nineteenth century. He offers a fascinating account of a century of rivalry between the French and German Catholic churches as each sought to maintain its position in the Holy Land, offering the reader a clear sense of the tensions—*inter muros* and *extra muros*—that dominated the period. Focusing on a few German Catholic missionaries whose work shaped the German Catholic presence in Palestine, Haim Goren gives a sense of the distinctive contribution of German Catholic activity, an area of scholarship hitherto neglected. The different kinds of missionary and other activity in which the German Catholic Church engaged in the Holy Land are discussed, such as the call in the late nineteenth century for German Catholic missions to focus initially on the need for tradesmen such as bakers, locksmiths, and carpenters. Goren gives the reader a sense of the multiplicity of approaches and engagements that occurred between the German Catholic Church and the Holy Land at this critical time. Barbara Haider-Wilson reminds us of the varied national interests that were competing for space and authority in Palestine up to the First World War. Looking at the Habsburg monarchy she introduces the reader to the ‘home mission abroad’. Her discussion presents the missionary country as itself the object of mission and explores how the social dimension of Christian work, which stimulated the ambitions of the Church, thrived off the phenomenon of ‘longing for Jerusalem’, whereby the significance of the Holy Places for the Catholic Church became a

mark of Catholic belief in general. The concern here was not with the evangelistic effort in Palestine, but rather with how the experience of the Holy Land could stimulate the life of the Church at home. The 'home mission' was developed in a number of ways: through pilgrimages that were made to the Holy Land and then written up and shared with congregations in Austria; through networks that were established between pilgrims who would share the experience of their spiritual journey with others; and through an active publishing industry, which issued magazines to inform and mobilize the public. In highlighting the different power-political considerations that were at play amongst the different crownlands of the Austrian and Austro-Hungarian 'Jerusalem' milieu, Haider-Wilson issues some timely challenges to the mission historian, including a call for a closer historiographical examination of Europe in research on mission history.

In her examination of the work of the Anglican Bishop Samuel Gobat, Charlotte van der Leest offers a clear and concise account of the factors that shaped and drove the social dimension of Protestant Evangelical work. Contrasting the approach of the Christian Mission Society adopted by Gobat with that of other Protestant and Catholic missions, she analyses the extent to which the 'social dimension' of the evangelical mission was centred on one of the four features which David Bebbington identified as defining late nineteenth-century evangelicalism: biblicism. This enabled the other features which Bebbington ascribes to an Evangelical understanding of 'true' Christian belief to flourish: crucicentrism, conversionism, and, to a lesser extent, activism. In her final paragraph, van der Leest refers to how unsuccessful Gobat's methods were in terms of numbers of actual converts. This leaves the reader with a question: how does van der Leest explain why thirty-seven Bible Schools yielded so little fruit?

Ruth Kark's and Shlomit Langboim's consideration of the formation of Jewish identity in the light of missionary activity in the Holy Land is well placed in the middle of the book, moving our attention to the impact of missions on community identity. This chapter presents the other side of mission: the reception and perception of mission by the so-called 'target' audiences. The role played by missionary organizations in the shaping of Jewish identity at the turn of the century is outlined and the social dimension of the missionary work remains most pertinent. Competition and rivalry are once again the

## Book Reviews

theme, but this time it was expressed by the Jewish establishment vis-à-vis the work of the missionary societies. As missionaries opened hospitals, schools, and welfare services across the country, the Jewish establishment responded: schools were established, welfare and aid offered for free, and efficient hospitals opened. All of this contributed to shaping a stronger sense of identity amongst the Jewish population. Engaging with these questions not only alerts us to the impact of missions in local contexts (the history of mentalities in Löffler's method), but also enhances our understanding of the wider and longer term impact of their work and its social effect in shaping other institutions and identities.

Yaron Perry's and Michael Marten's research into the work of the Protestant missionary societies addresses medical missions to the Jews. Perry examines the Protestant London Jewish Society's (LJS) engagement with social missions through their medical work in Palestine. His comparison between the failures of the enterprise in Jerusalem and the more successful efforts of the LJS's hospital work in Safed relates the question of missionary and welfare 'success' to the social and economic climate of the target population. Marten gives a helpful account of the theological basis of Scottish missions in Palestine, several aspects of which also help to frame some of the other contributions. The sense that if it were possible to convert Jews in Palestine to Protestantism, conversions elsewhere would follow is presented as one reason for the Scottish Church's decision to go to Palestine. The theological justifications for this are fleshed out with an account of the prevailing evangelical priorities of the period. In a helpful turn Marten explores the question of why medical missions were so popular. A discussion of the methodology of mission study underscores Marten's paper. He concludes with a call for the 're-historicising' of missions in Palestine and exhorts his colleagues to address mission history through multiple lenses: 'mission history needs to see *all* the actors involved in the fusing of histories.' This, he suggests, happens through analyses of the social dimension of missions.

Jakob Eisler approaches the missionary question by looking at mission propaganda and film in European missionary efforts in Palestine. He discusses two films which, he argues, typify the German Christian missionary films of Palestine in the nineteenth century: the film of the Syrian Orphanage in Jerusalem and a film that



recorded the work of the Kaiserswerth deaconesses in the Holy Land. Both are reported to have been well received by parishes in Germany and played an important part in 'selling' the missionary project (although Eisler nuances this claim by referring to some negative criticisms and to a lack of substantial archival evidence in the case of the Kaiserswerth film). This article opens up a fascinating field of research, from which we can only hope to hear more. It would be interesting, for example, to ask how this kind of propaganda work by the churches ties in with the wider missionary effort, both at home and abroad.

With Christine Pschichholz's essay we change location and community studied. The question is addressed here through the experience of German Protestant communities in Turkey against the background of European migration under the Ottoman Empire. Pschichholz raises the pertinent question of the impact of social Protestantism on the development of German cultural and educational policy abroad in terms of the care of its own people. She invites the reader to look at the 'home missions abroad' question the other way around: where 'home' has travelled 'abroad' and Diaspora care becomes another avenue for exploring these questions.

The relationship between German Protestantism and the state of Israel is presented in Gerhard Gronauer's account of the various projects and engagements that characterized engagement between 1948 and 1967. Alongside the traditional missions to the Jews that continued to use salvific history and the perception of the Jews as the biblical people of God to justify the state of Israel, Gronauer identifies 'the "progressive" voices' (p. 214) that emerged after 1948 where the notion of the state of Israel as a sign of the end times is introduced. The German-Israeli reparations agreement of 1952 was another stage in the process, which was followed by the emergence of a touristic relationship between Germany and the state of Israel. Further 'official' visits stemmed from this new tourism. One of the points to emerge from Gronauer's work is that Protestantism helped the German Federal Government to open up to Israel as part of a process in which the reception of the state of Israel moved from being a primarily theological one to what Gronauer describes as the 'golden period' of pro-Israeli engagement within the Church, when Protestants became more willing to accept Israel as a consequence of the Shoah. These changes, Gronauer suggests, also opened the door for Jewish-

## Book Reviews

Christian dialogue. Gronauer's knowledge of the subject in this period is extensive and covers an impressive number of bases.

Uwe Kaminsky's chapter on the contribution of the *Palaestinawerk* after the Second World War is a fitting conclusion to the book. His account of the creation of this organization, a loose and temporary association of the German boards, records the last in the line of German social missionary work in Palestine following the confiscation of German Protestant institutions by the British at the end of the war. The *Palaestinawerk* emerged out of negotiations between the state of Israel and the Lutheran World Federation over compensation and ownership of property. Through successful negotiations the organization oversaw the material rebuilding of German Protestant institutions in Palestine as well as the payment of compensation. It later gave rise to new Protestant initiatives in Palestine including hospital and educational work. The final piece in the reconstruction of German Protestant institutions was the establishment of a native church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Jordan, which was founded in 1957. The *Palaestinawerk* began to disband as the mission organizations integrated into the Protestant Church in Germany. In tying up the ends, Kaminsky subtly reminds the reader of some of the threads running through the book. Chief amongst these are the competition between the various missionary endeavours; the lack of any apparent concern among missionaries about the paucity of conversions; and the extent to which the social dimension of the work of these institutions shaped the nature of the missionary engagement with Palestine.

This book is a valuable addition to the history of missions and it heralds a new departure for this expanding field. Only with inter-disciplinary, trans-national, and trans-era studies such as the ones collected here can we begin, as Marten puts it, to see how mission history relates 'the *past* to the potential *presents* that there might have been, a way of perhaps appreciating the *futures* that there might now be' (p. 177).

CATRIONA LAING is a doctoral candidate at the Faculty of Divinity, University of Cambridge.

ANNE SUDROW, *Der Schuh im Nationalsozialismus: Eine Produktgeschichte im deutsch-britisch-amerikanischen Vergleich* (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2010), 876 pp. ISBN 978 3 8353 0793 3. €69.90

The 800-page book-of-a-German-Ph.D.-thesis on the history of footwear under review here is one of the most interesting things I can remember reading. This is not a sentence I ever imagined myself writing. Yet in this outstanding account of the history of the shoe in Germany between the 1920s and the 1950s the author succeeds not only in her ambition to place the study of material culture at the interstices of histories of both production and consumption, but also places it at the centre of histories of science, fashion, retail, semiotics, knowledge-transfer, globalization, violence, ritual, trade, transnationalism, regulation, and more. As if this were not a challenging enough undertaking, the German example is placed firmly within a comparative context. At regular intervals, the author draws in material on the British and American shoe industries to great effect. The author's grasp of the huge variety of historical and scholarly discourses needed to make sense of these various stories is remarkable. It is a phenomenal achievement.

At the start of the period under review, the culture of shoe-wearing was in a state of transition. Hitherto, shoes had been regarded solely as items of practical utility, as something to protect the feet and keep them warm. The use of footwear as an item of decoration and display was the preserve of very specific, mostly elite groups, such as the military. In rural areas, in particular, many people still did not wear them as a matter of habit. While patterns of shoe ownership naturally mapped at least partially onto patterns of wealth, however, this also reflected enduring beliefs about both health and propriety: many believed that walking bare-foot was better for one's health, and that shoes ought properly to be worn only to school and to church. How long a shoe would last was the most important criterion for a purchaser. Shoe and boot design changed little as a result; manufacturers produced comparatively large production runs of a limited range of designs; and the processes whereby the product was brought to market were also simple and comparatively stable.

At the same time, the 1920s saw the emergence of new patterns of demand and habits of consumption driven by fashion: all of a sudden, colour mattered. Advances in anatomical understanding also

## Book Reviews

placed new demands on manufacturers to supply shoes in correct shapes and sizes. This led in the 1920s to a great proliferation of the range of models, shapes, and sizes a retailer needed to stock in order to keep his customers happy. In a later era manufacturers would learn to use these factors to their advantage, fostering a culture in which parents felt obliged to get their children's feet measured every six weeks and buy new shoes at the first minor signs of growth, and in which adult consumers could be encouraged to own several pairs of shoes and buy yet more, even when their existing ones were not worn out. Yet in the 1920s manufacturers and retailers regarded the growing complexity of the market and its increasing fickleness with a great deal more unease: how to cope with the need to supply the market with such massive variety of models in much smaller production runs whilst keeping costs down? What to do with all those bright blue shoes just made at great expense now that consumers had decided they simply must have this season's red instead? Combating such 'market imperfection' and remaining competitive was even more of a headache in the challenging economic environment of the 1920s and the Depression in particular, especially given the presence of vigorous competition from the Czechoslovakian firm Bat'a, which flooded the market with more cheaply produced footwear in this period.

Drawing on insights provided by the burgeoning rationalization and scientific management movement, manufacturers reacted in a number of ways. In the first place, the introduction of sizing norms made it possible to make some components of the shoe in larger volumes and thus more cost effectively. They also introduced new machine tools, leased from America, facilitating more cost-effective production. Machine-tool production also accelerated the experimentation with synthetic materials and thus served, at least in part, to displace the stitching and nailing of footwear by practices of moulding or gluing. Meanwhile, larger manufacturers built up retail chains that enabled them to distribute more cost-effective large production runs nationally, sending a few examples of each shoe or size to a large number of outlets simultaneously. This was the era in which household name footwear chains emerged, in Germany as in Britain. A nascent market research industry also emerged, with the support of the retailers, to try to understand and thus predict changing patterns of demand, in the hope that the wastefulness called forth by the fickle dictates of fashion could be reduced. The new machine

tools gradually displaced older work methods, and thus placed old-style craft production under strain, with all the known political and social strains that caused; likewise, the new networks of distribution placed pressure on small retailers who struggled to compete. Nonetheless, the comparatively small production runs of each shoe model meant that a genuine mass production regime was never achieved in the shoe industry.

Two of the main obstacles to cost-reduction, mechanization, and a more efficient utilization of raw materials were the expense and variability of the hides used in traditional leather shoes. Many of these were also imported, which, given Germany's foreign exchange situation and the political imperatives of the Nazi regime, posed an additional challenge. Hitherto scholarship on the economic history of the Third Reich has tended to assume that the foreign exchange regime of the Four-Year-Plan, its drive for synthetic substitute materials, and its attempts to regulate various market vagaries ran counter to the interests of the consumer goods industries. However, as the author shows, the regime's encouragement of synthetic materials coincided with this particular industry's desire to use them, leading to significant advances in the use of substitute materials in footwear in the 1930s; similarly, the regime's fostering of rational consumption habits in the interests of autarky and national economic efficiency chimed with the desire of the industry to rein in consumer choice and limit its product palette. The production of shoes from pig leather and fish skin did not, in the long run, catch on, but the use of (synthetic) rubberized soles, for example, did. Here, in particular, the comparative dimension of the book comes into its own. For, as the author shows, processes which, seen within a purely national frame, might appear to be the product of adverse political regulation peculiar to the Third Reich, were similarly underway in the United States, if less so in Britain where the predilection for leather shoes remained strong.

At the same time, the author is careful not to allow her account of the presence of rationalizing, modernizing dynamics in this particular technical sphere to generate an image of a shoe industry making great strides towards efficiency in an environment sealed off from the violence of the Third Reich. In so far as the industry retained access to supplies of leather during the war, it was largely on the basis of plunder: Germans' supply of footwear, no less than their supply of

## Book Reviews

iron ores, rested on industry's implication in the war of genocidal destruction in the East. This was not all. In pursuit of more scientific understanding of the durability of various synthetic shoe components, the industry connived in the establishment of a shoe-testing facility at Sachsenhausen concentration camp in 1940. An unaccounted for number of prisoners were forced to walk, march, or perform sporting exercises in shoes for hours on end, day after day, in a practice which claimed the lives of many, so exhausting and brutal was it. The shoes, meanwhile, were measured for their signs of wear and tear.

In the limited literature on this phenomenon, which mostly comes from survivor accounts, it has understandably been written about as a form of the pointless, ritualized torture which was one part of the dynamic of violence meted out by the SS. However, using materials from the various trade bodies, research institutes, and organs of self-regulation connected to the shoe industry the author demonstrates how private companies, scientists, and other researchers—including those working for the *Wehrmacht*—not only knew about the research, but made good use of the findings in their pursuit of more efficient product design and specification. Some of the findings made their way into standard industrial handbooks on shoe design in the 1950s, while the researchers concerned made good careers in the industry or its trade bodies. The broad outline of this trajectory is hardly surprising, in so far as we know all about similar histories from studies of Nazi medicine, but the author's account of the chains of agency, interest, and knowledge-transfer linking the commercial consumer sector of the economy to the murderousness of the concentration camps is exceptionally persuasive and hard-hitting. As if this were not enough, she then demonstrates how the photographed piles of shoes that have become such iconic signifiers of Nazi mass murder and thus of the imagined singularity of the regime were embedded in chains of recycling in which commercial shoe manufacturers and repairers were also directly implicated. In a sad irony, one of the companies most associated with this was Salamander, one of the Jewish-owned companies that had been 'Aryanized' before the war.

There is far more to this marvellous book than a short review can capture. Given its remarkable qualities it seems churlish to offer criticism. For a study focused on diverse aspects of rationalization in the 1920s and 1930s one might have expected some engagement with the

*A History of the Shoe in National Socialism*

pioneering works of Tilla Siegel, Thomas von Freyberg, and Carola Sachse, whose insights laid the ground for much of the work on which the author draws. Inevitably, there are sections in an 800-page book where the reader's spirits flag, and where one wonders whether some editing down might not have improved the readability of the book at little cost to the comprehensiveness of its argument. No self-respecting German Ph.D. monograph would spare its reader a fifty-page discussion of the state of research, *Fragestellung*, and methodology; a suitably earnest discussion of the definition of a shoe is also, of course, a must. Yet life is short, and the half-hour I devoted to mastering the different kinds of shoe polish available to consumers in the 1920s is a half-hour of my life that I will not get back.

On the other hand, scholarly monographs, like shoes, have their own product history – they can no more be seen as isolated objects, standing outside of time and space, than the things with laces that we wear on our feet. In that sense, any such critical remarks are as much a comment on the academic *habitus* that consistently produces such books as it is on the book itself. The culture of subsidy which permeates German scholarly publishing, combined with a scholarly environment which places such emphasis on thoroughness, can all too easily permit indulgence. Rather like the German manufacturers this book describes – ambivalent about their customers, and irritated by their habits – one often feels that German academic authors ought to take their readers a bit less for granted. Who knows, they might then, like those shoe manufacturers this book brings to life so superbly, even produce objects that can compete without subsidy in the marketplace.

NEIL GREGOR is Professor of History at the University of Southampton. His research interests range widely across twentieth-century German history, encompassing aspects of business history, social history, cultural history, literary studies, and historiography. Recent publications include *Haunted City: Nuremberg and the Nazi Past* (2008) and *How to Read Hitler* (2005).

DIETMAR SÜSS, *Tod aus der Luft: Kriegsgesellschaft und Luftkrieg in Deutschland und England* (Munich: Siedler, 2011), 717 pp. ISBN 978 3 88680 932 5. €29.99

Stumble into a German bookshop this autumn, and no doubt you will see Dietmar Süß's new book on the air war between 1940 and 1945 prominently displayed. This is no mean feat for a volume which grew out of a *Habilitation* thesis, a type of work that is not commonly known to be a page-turner. The publication of *Tod aus der Luft* is to be highly welcomed, not least because it breaks into a market that for too long has been dominated by popular accounts on the one hand and official histories on the other.<sup>1</sup> Süß's extraordinary book combines the virtues of both genres: delivered with great panache, it is also based on a scrupulous examination of archival records. Potential buyers of *Tod aus der Luft* can expect multiple 'two-in-one' deals: not only is this book both sophisticated and accessible, written by an academic historian with a background in journalism, it is also a stimulating synthesis of the social, political, and cultural history of war, and a thoughtful comparative study of Britain (or 'England', as Süß has it) and Germany in the era of the Second World War.

The success of any work of comparative history hinges ultimately on the choice of an appropriate *tertium comparationis*, for the units of comparison must be distinct and yet not too disparate to yield significant contrasts. Thus historians of this period have traditionally favoured juxtaposing Nazi Germany with other 'totalitarian' or 'fascist' regimes. A comparison between British and German societies during the Second World War is a much bolder, methodologically riskier undertaking, and one can think of at least two good reasons against such a bipartite project: firstly, and most fundamentally, that the different political regimes preclude any meaningful comparison, that the outcome of the analysis is a foregone conclusion; and, secondly, that the author is comparing apples with oranges, that the timing and intensity of the German Blitz on Britain and the British strategic air campaign against Germany were simply too different to yield any telling contrasts.

Süß is fully aware of the potential pitfalls of the comparative design of his book, and he resoundingly rejects both these objections.

<sup>1</sup> See Nicholas Stargardt, 'Victims of Bombing and Retaliation', *German Historical Institute London Bulletin*, 26/2 (2004), 56–70.



At the centre of this comparative study are not the political systems (even though Süß has a great deal to say about their institutional structures) but the emergence of a *Kriegsmoral* (war morale) at the intersection of individual experiences and political mobilization. Moreover, this hefty tome is not meant to be a comprehensive account of the British and German bombing campaigns of the Second World War. Rather, the author's approach might be described as a history of the air war 'from below': one that is focused on the fear, experience, and memory (of people on the ground) of death and destruction. That said, the book spans an impressively wide range of topics, from pre-war anticipation to post-war commemoration, from administrative measures to theological discourses, from air-raid precautions to the disposal of corpses, and from political propaganda to private testimony.

The ways in which people lived through air raids were neither unfiltered nor immediate. Süß painstakingly dissects the administrative structures and air-raid precautions that framed personal experiences of the air war. Predictably enough, at this level of comparison, the contrasts between British democracy and Nazi dictatorship are most striking: the reordering of and bickering over responsibilities in Britain pale into insignificance when compared with the spiralling de-institutionalization and *Führerunmittelbarkeit* of decision-making in Germany. Even though the introduction of Regional Commissioners to oversee (and, if necessary, to overrule) county and borough councils amounted to a significant intervention in regional and local affairs, conflicts tended to be resolved in a consensual manner. Also the new coordinating body at national level, the Civil Defence Committee, did not, according to Süß, fundamentally depart from pre-war administrative practice.

While the new structures and procedures introduced in Britain at the beginning of the conflict remained more or less unchanged for the remainder of the war, German ones evolved in increasingly radical ways in the second half of the war. Führer decrees of March 1942 and December 1943 – giving great leeway for interpretation (and the political ambitions of Joseph Goebbels) – led to the creation of an Inter-Ministerial Air War Damage Board and a Reich Inspectorate of Civil Defence Measures respectively. Control of both these special authorities gave Goebbels far-reaching powers at the home front, often bypassing the competences of ministers, *Gauleiter*, and municipi-

## Book Reviews

pal authorities. The latter faced additional competition from local branches of the Nazi party and its welfare organization, the NSV, which tried to muscle in on support for bomb victims.

The comparison between administrative responses to the spectre and actuality of the war from the air produces interesting, but perhaps not altogether surprising contrasts. Most revealing is the author's intricate discussion of the social construction of a wartime community where we see both cultural convergences and national peculiarities. The notion of a People's War in Britain, he argues, was to some degree a response to the Nazi utopia of a *Volksgemeinschaft*.<sup>2</sup> Both held out a social promise and relied on mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion, on punishments and rewards. Looters were seen as the ultimate threat to *Kriegsmoral* and became outcasts from the national collectives. Politically motivated amendments to the criminal law prescribed severe penalties for the offence. However, the Nazis came down much harder on looters, many of whom were sentenced to death by special courts. While the prosecution of looters paved the way for a complete erosion of the rule of law in Nazi Germany, the British state neither encroached on the autonomy of the judiciary nor dispensed with the statutory right of appeal. Significantly, British legal terminology had no equivalent to the *Volksschädling* that cast the criminal as the nation's 'vermin'.

Under the conditions of aerial bombardment, air-raid shelters became the incubators of the national community at risk. In both countries, access to the official shelters and bunkers was seen as a privilege that had to be earned through a display of virtues such as self-help, discipline, duty, and a readiness to make sacrifices. Aliens and particularly 'Jews' occupied a precarious position in these collective safe havens. A thorn in the side of many a Londoner, (German) Jews were blamed for the crowded conditions, the temporary eruptions of violence, and, more generally, the moral decay in the shelters. Anti-alien sentiments were, for instance, in evidence in the small bulletins edited by representatives of the shelter communities. However, the mere existence of these grass-roots organs is illustrative of the multivocality of the People's War and its bottom-up dynamics. Conformism and coercion played a much greater role in

<sup>2</sup> See also the conference report 'German Society in the Nazi Era: *Volksgemeinschaft* between Ideological Projection and Social Practice', *German Historical Institute London Bulletin*, 32/2 (2010), 120–8.

transforming the *Volksgemeinschaft* into a *Luftschutzgemeinschaft*, and yet it was initially the peer pressure of the *Hausgemeinschaft* rather than official regulations that kept the Jews out.

From the authorities' point of view, the mass deportations from the Reich resolved this issue. What is more, the deportations provided an opportunity for municipal authorities to strengthen morale at the urban home front in a material way, for the possessions the deported left behind were re-distributed to bombed-out *Volksgenossen*. German municipalities became first opportunistic profiteers and eventually active agents of repression. As the air raids intensified, local authorities came to rely on the slave labour of concentration camp inmates to clear up the rubble. In cooperation with the SS, a number of municipalities established satellite camps in the very heart of cities. Thus city centres became sites where urban society intersected with the camp system. The connections between the air war and Nazi racial policies were all too obvious for anyone who bothered to enquire about the source of bargain furniture, or who cared to observe that bunkers were built on the sites of former synagogues.

The bombs on German cities were 'a retribution for what was done to the Jews' (p. 272), according to the Protestant bishop of Württemberg, Theophil Wurm. While there was broad agreement among Catholic and Protestant churchmen alike that the havoc wreaked on German cities was part of a divine punishment, few were as explicit as Wurm about the actual sins committed. Instead they implored their flock to accept His judgment unquestioningly and to endure the ordeal. The air war or the churches' response to it did little to attract new followers, but at least it strengthened the faith of believers (a similar development could be observed in Britain during the Blitz). Süß points out that the churches' message allowed German Christians to reconcile an increasing alienation from National Socialism with a renewed commitment to the *Volksgemeinschaft*. Whereas the churches in Germany eschewed going beyond a merely theological interpretation of the air war, their British counterparts openly confronted its political and ethical implications. Here, Süß attaches much importance to the interventions made by the Anglican bishop of Chichester, George Bell, who emerged as a chief doubter of the strategic bombing campaign.

The People's War could accommodate nonconformist behaviour and critical voices—in stark contrast to the absolute project of the

## Book Reviews

*Volksgemeinschaft*. Nevertheless, Süß concludes that 'the pressure of ritualized collectivization and the imposition of norms of social behaviour are characteristics of both dictatorship and democracy, of the politics of war morale in "total war" '(p. 580). The construction of a *Kriegsmoral* became *the* central preoccupation of both societies during the air war. This book offers an intriguing exploration of the comparative method; the author's discussion of British society during the Blitz throws many aspects of the German experience of the air war into much sharper relief (and vice versa). This monograph is a must for those interested not only in the comparative history of Britain and Germany but also the socio-cultural and political history of modern warfare. Covering two countries in equal depth and sophistication, this excellent book should also appeal to British readers very much accustomed to the idea of 'buy one, get one free'.

STEFAN GOEBEL is Senior Lecturer in Modern British History at the University of Kent at Canterbury. His publications include *The Great War and Medieval Memory: War, Remembrance and Medievalism in Britain and Germany, 1914–1940* (2007) and, as co-editor, *Cities into Battlefields: Metropolitan Scenarios, Experiences and Commemorations of Total War* (2011). He is currently working on a comparative study of Coventry and Dresden in the aftermath of the Second World War.

OLAF BLASCHKE, *Verleger machen Geschichte: Buchhandel und Historiker seit 1945 im deutsch-britischen Vergleich*, *Moderne Zeit: Neue Forschungen zur Gesellschafts- und Kulturgeschichte des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts*, 22 (Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag, 2010), 667 pp. ISBN 978 3 8353 0757 5. €48.00

Olaf Blaschke's research monograph analyses an under-researched area in the history of historiography: the relations between publishing houses and the production of historical knowledge. The underlying assumption of the book is that the making of history cannot be explained by developments within the historical profession alone. Blaschke focuses on how agents external to the historical profession influenced the writing and publishing of historical knowledge. The book deals with one of the key intermediary institutions between professional historians on the one hand and the scholarly and general public on the other. Indeed, it argues convincingly that publishers were more than simply 'mediators' between historians and the public. By using Bourdieu's concept of the field, Blaschke shows that publishers had a considerable impact on the constitution of the field of professional history and the historical knowledge it produced. But he is not merely interested in reconstructing the unidirectional influence publishers had on the production of history. Instead he seeks to analyse the complex relationship between publishers and historians within a shared social space.

The first two chapters of the book prepare the ground by outlining how publishing houses and the historical professions developed in twentieth-century Britain and Germany. The following two chapters begin to bring the two fields together by exploring the structural conditions for publishing history books. Largely based on quantitative data, chapter three reconstructs how the publishing market for history books developed in West Germany and Britain after 1945. In chapter four, Blaschke moves on to delineate the field of publishing houses which engaged in publishing history books.

The remaining four chapters analyse the various and multifaceted relationships between individual publishers and historians. The first of these examines the different motivations and strategies publishers pursued in their professional activity. Blaschke downplays the significance of purely commercial interests and instead highlights the role of publishers as intermediaries, gatekeepers, ini-

## Book Reviews

tiators of new research, or even missionaries for particular approaches. In chapter six he turns the tables to look at how historians, as part of their publication strategies, spent considerable time finding suitable and reputable publishers. The choice of a particular publisher was rarely accidental. On the contrary, Blaschke demonstrates that historians pursued distinct strategies to find the publisher who best served their professional interests, even if this act of strategizing was not necessarily a conscious one. They often looked for a publisher with a reputation that corresponded to their own scholarly reputation and their desired position in the historical profession. Chapter seven analyses how publishers shaped individual history books at various stages in the publishing process and how they therefore influenced historical scholarship. The final chapter argues that publishers played a significant part in supporting new historical journals or in shaping the direction of existing ones.

One of the many fascinating discussions in the book, and perhaps its most innovative part, is the analysis of how West German publishers positioned themselves within the social space of history book publishing (chapter four). Blaschke designs a two-dimensional matrix to map the position of individual publishers in the field that takes into account both the reputation of a publishing house and its political and intellectual orientation. This reconstruction of the field enables Blaschke to show the significant transformation that occurred in the world of publishing in the late 1960s and early 1970s. During this time the Göttingen-based publisher Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht strategically shifted its position in the field and emerged as the leading publisher of 'critical' and 'progressive' history associated with a more left-leaning political stance. This shift in its intellectual and political orientation was accompanied by a significant gain in reputation. As Blaschke convincingly shows, the publisher contributed significantly to the institutionalization of the new social history in West Germany, while its reputation also benefited from the growth to prominence of the so-called Bielefeld School.

The comparative focus of the book, although it seems to pay more attention to Germany than Britain, allows Blaschke to draw some interesting conclusions about national, in particular German, peculiarities. For example, German publishing houses were more prone to identify with a particular political tendency than their British counterparts. German historians often even selected their publisher on the

basis not only of reputation but also of political orientation. Publishing practices in West Germany therefore tended to reflect and reinforce the formation of different schools of historical thought.

Blaschke's study is a valuable contribution to the new history of historiography that moves away from studying the rise and fall of historiographical paradigms. It seeks to contextualize what historians (and publishers) do and to explain why certain interpretations of history emerge and prevail while others disappear. The particular value of this study is its focus on an agent that, despite being technically outside the historical profession, has played a significant part in making professional history available to its public and scholarly audiences. It therefore draws a more complex and sophisticated picture of the production of professional history as a social process. And it stimulates further reflection on how wider socio-cultural transformations affect the writing of history via institutions that shape the conditions of what professional historians write, what they can publish, and therefore what they can say.

Perhaps a little too often, the study focuses on the different ways in which publishers influenced professional history. If history publishing is a social space where two different professions meet, as it is argued, how did professional historians influence publishers and their professional practices? Furthermore, it may have been worthwhile exploring how the two nationally constituted fields, which are treated as separate and independent units, interacted with one another. How did historians who were interested in having their work translated and published in the other country deal with the different publishing traditions and practices that they encountered? For example, some of the German historians Blaschke has drawn on provide interesting cases of such intercultural relations between German historians and British publishers. Admittedly, both questions go beyond the main objective of the book and therefore do not diminish its significant merits.

STEPHAN PETZOLD is a Lecturer in Modern European History at the University of Leeds. His Ph.D. thesis analysed the heated debate over the origins of the First World War provoked in the 1960s by Fritz Fischer's book *Germany's Aims in the First World War* (1961).

CHRISTIAN L. GLOSSNER, *The Making of the German Post-War Economy: Political Communication and Public Reception of the Social Market Economy after World War Two* (London: Tauris Academic Studies, 2010), xxvi + 289 pp. ISBN 978 1 84885 264 8. £59.50

Do we need another book on the making of the economic order in Germany after the Second World War, something that has been so well examined over the last six decades? Is there new historical evidence to be discovered, or are there new theoretical approaches waiting to be applied? In his study, Christian L. Glossner suggests that the concept of the Social Market Economy (*Soziale Marktwirtschaft*) was successful in Germany because both academic and political circles publicly campaigned for it. According to Glossner, in 1948 Ludwig Erhard and Konrad Adenauer were able to persuade the public and the socio-political elite to accept their economic ideas, as opposed to the diffuse and less programmatic concepts of the Social Democrats. Thus they overcame the challenge posed by the broad acceptance of socialist ideas among the German public after the war.

Glossner presents his argument in two parts. The first, comprising two-thirds of the book, looks at the different economic concepts developed by academics and political parties between 1945 and 1949. The second, consisting of about fifty pages, concentrates on the public reactions to the concepts by examining a wide range of sources, such as opinion polls, newspaper articles, and parliamentary petitions. Given that Glossner lists no fewer than twenty-seven archives in the appendix, it comes as a surprise that this second part, which is so important for the book's hypothesis and its innovative aspirations, is predominantly based on published material.

The first of three chapters that cover the evolution of neo-liberal schools in Germany applies somewhat idiosyncratic definitions of the different schools of thought. The Freiburg Circles are described as consisting of the members of the former 'workgroup Erwin von Beckerath', a successor to the economists assembled in the Nazi Academy of German Law. These often met in the house of Walter Eucken, the group's intellectual leader, to discuss what aims and problems the economic order would have once the war was over. Surprisingly, Glossner includes Friedrich Lutz, a pupil of Walter Eucken, in this group, although Lutz had been in Princeton since 1938 and only returned to Freiburg after Eucken's death in 1950. According to



Glossner, the Freiburg Circles formed the nucleus of the famous Advisory Council of the Economic Administration (later of the Ministry of Economics). Glossner mistakenly identifies the liberal Frankfurt law professor Franz Böhm, who collaborated with Eucken in Freiburg, as the chairman of this council. In fact, Böhm chaired only the initial meeting at which the sociologist Heinz Sauer mann became the first elected chairman. Though widely repeated in the literature, this is a significant mistake because it suggests that the advisory council was a neo-liberal think-tank for German economic policy whereas, in fact, its members had been carefully selected by the economist Hans Moeller to represent as many competing economic approaches as possible.

Unlike the first Freiburg group, the second, which Glossner calls the Freiburg School, did not limit itself to an academic audience. Wilhelm Röpke is described as the core figure of this strand of neo-liberalism. He was deeply convinced that only economic subjects fully familiar with how the market economy functioned could make rational economic decisions and that, consequently, the market economy would not work without trained economists. The education of the public certainly lay at the heart of ordo-liberal economic thought (an insight justifiably emphasized by Glossner and one which deserves more scholarly attention). The Freiburg School, however, was less clear cut than a third school of thought which Glossner names the Cologne School. Again, Glossner's terminology appears to be at least questionable, as it consisted only of Alfred Mueller-Armack, the school's principal, and Ludwig Erhard, who can hardly be considered Mueller-Armack's pupil. Erhard and Mueller-Armack promoted the Social Market Economy as an intellectual brand and Glossner presents the institutions and the people carrying out the campaign. At this point, arguably one of the strongest parts of the book, Glossner shows how emphatically Erhard and a group of industrialists, journalists, and politicians fought for the Social Market Economy.

Two chapters follow on the evolution of the economic concepts of the German Social Democratic Party and the Christian Democratic Union, including the Christian Social Union in Bavaria. These chapters contain little information that is not known from the existing literature on party politics and, to some extent, parts of them deviate from the overall narrative of the book. The following chapters on

## Book Reviews

public opinion are organized chronologically. They document a slow shift from a dominantly socialist attitude in Western Germany to a strong belief in the Social Market Economy as revealed in surveys from mid 1949. This is a worthwhile approach that complements the few studies that exist on individual newspapers, but it requires more advanced methods (for example, discourse analysis or quantifying methods) to produce reliable results.

All in all, Glossner's story of the success of the concept of the Social Market Economy in German public opinion is not entirely convincing, firstly, because of a rather selective reading of the material that too often uses myths to 'prove' the impact of the Social Market Economy, such as Ludwig Erhard's description of himself in his *Wohlstand für Alle* (1957), for example. Secondly, Glossner equates the electoral success of a political party with the success of a particular economic programme whereas, as he himself points out, programmes were not always accepted and promoted without discussion by political parties. And, of course, they might not be the reason for voting for a party, let alone the main reason. Finally, the economic concepts examined are much too diffuse to allow their acceptance by public opinion to be researched. The methods of the early opinion polls were too questionable and Glossner's information on the newspapers is too limited to suggest such a strong correlation. Large parts of the book, therefore, consist of a comprehensive summary of the existing literature and present few new insights into the early history of the Social Market Economy.

JAN-OTMAR HESSE is Professor of Economic History at the University of Bielefeld. His main publications include *Die Wirtschaft als Wissenschaft: Bundesdeutsche Volkswirtschaftslehre zwischen Weltkrieg und Ölpreiskrise* (2010) and *Im Netz der Kommunikation: Die Reichs-Post- und Telegraphenverwaltung 1876–1914* (2002).

PAUL BETTS, *Within Walls: Private Life in the German Democratic Republic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), xi + 321 pp. ISBN 978 0 19 920884 5. £35.00

Paul Betts has written an important book. Its subject is history within walls in a double sense. It refers first to the wall protecting the border, after 1961, of a country where, after National Socialism, socialism as a dictatorship of the Socialist Unity Party (SED) was developed and secured; and secondly to the walls of houses and flats behind which what we call private life took place. This is often thought of as a protected life, screened from state intervention and unreasonable political demands, one that is shaped by individuals themselves in relative autonomy, and in which personal relations are marked by trust. This life takes place predominantly at what we call 'home', and is what Betts's investigation concentrates on. He asks about relations between a state which is interested in controlling the private sphere as far as possible, and citizens who are prepared to do anything to create and maintain, even, if possible, to expand, it. Simply by posing this question, the author positions himself among those historians who believe in the possibility of a sphere of this kind, which is not completely at the mercy of the dictatorship; for whom the history of the GDR is not purely the history of domination, but draws its dynamic from the tension between state and stubborn citizens, between control and self-regulation.

Of course, Betts does not assume that the private sphere is the complete Other of the dictatorship. What interests him is the relationship between the private and the political in the GDR, in which he does not see the private as totally subjected to the political, but rather regards this relationship as built on tough negotiating processes in which the borders between each of these spheres and the spaces for negotiation within them are at stake. Betts follows the history of these negotiations between the state and private citizens from the beginning of the GDR to its end in seven chapters. Most of these look at if not the whole of GDR history, then at long periods within it, and, beyond this, they examine in detail the earlier history of the phenomena under investigation, at times going back as far as the nineteenth century. As a result, Betts does not reduce the relationship between the private and the political to the GDR (or the system of state socialism in general), but defines these as part of the wider phe-

## Book Reviews

nomenon of modernity. This story is framed in the history of the state security service from its refinement into an ever more perfect and perfidious instrument of control, reaching far into the intimate sphere (chapter one), to the dissolution of the Stasi and the reappropriation of private sovereignty by the citizens who had been spied upon (Epilogue). In between there are six chapters in which depth probes are taken. Concentrating on individual aspects or groups of sources, they look at the creation of, the threat to, and the transformation of the public sphere in an exemplary way. Specifically, chapter two looks at the Christian milieu in the GDR and the struggle they had to assert themselves; chapter three discusses divorce cases and judgements as a source for the significance of marriage and family in the GDR; chapter four examines the 'correct' lifestyle, investigating the (standardized) interior decoration of flats and rules for behaviour; chapter five is devoted to cases of arbitration in disputes between neighbours, casting light on the sources of such conflicts and the social self-organization behind their resolution; chapter six presents petitions and their concerns, which demonstrate what was expected of the state, in material and social terms, for the shaping of a good life; and, finally, chapter seven is concerned with the artistic shaping of the private sphere in GDR photography.

What holds these individual studies together is not only the issue of the conditions governing the material, social, and emotional life of the citizens under SED rule, but also a process of transformation common to them all. This can be summed up briefly as follows. In the course of GDR history, the private sphere assumed increasing significance. This applied not only to the citizens, for whom home and family became by far the most important aspects of their lives, and which, as a matter of course, they increasingly demanded the right to shape themselves. It was also true of the perspective of the state and Party, who made the private sphere possible through their social policies and policies of consumption and even permitted its self-regulation within certain limits. But in individual cases—such as an emergency created by subversion—they kept a check on it through intensive observation and intervention to the point of destruction.

The book's subtitle, *Private Life in the German Democratic Republic*, raises the wrong expectations to some extent because what it is really about is concepts of the private within state socialism. These arose on the one hand out of the political leadership's totalitarian expecta-

tions of forming, penetrating, and controlling the private sphere; on the other out of the class-specific blueprints which citizens drew up of the lives they wanted to live, and their demands for autonomy. As Betts correctly sees this as a basic conflict in the political and social history of the GDR and investigates it in exemplary fashion, the history he writes is located at the level of these blueprints and demands, and their negotiation, rather than at the level of everyday practices in the private sphere. This also applies to the chapters which deal with citizens' initiatives such as petitions, a type of text designed to appeal to the ruling authorities; to arbitration cases in which the people themselves intervened, creating order and smoothing things over; and to the photographs of private living spaces, in which stage-managed presentations of the family were put together for the photographer from outside. The GDR's 'private' citizens always behaved with an eye to their opposite numbers outside their walls.

This is partly a problem of the sources, for it is in the nature of the privacy achieved within the GDR that it successfully closed itself to the source-generating public sphere. Betts, however, obviously made a decision not to put possible private testimonies at the centre of his investigation (amateur photographs, diaries, correspondences, utensils and the interior decoration of flats, the practices of the black economy, and so on), and his use of the interviews he himself conducted is limited. Instead, he seeks the private sphere where it intersects with the social and the political, where it has to explain and defend itself, where it is observed and documented. This procedure proves to be highly illuminating and productive, not only for a history of the private sphere in the GDR, but beyond this for a social history of the GDR in the best sense.

DOROTHEE WIERLING is Deputy Director of the Forschungsstelle für Zeitgeschichte in Hamburg. Her publications include *Mädchen für Alles: Arbeitsalltag und Lebensgeschichte städtischer Dienstmädchen um die Jahrhundertwende* (1987) and *Geboren im Jahr Eins. Der Geburtsjahrgang 1949: Versuch einer Kollektivbiographie* (2002). She is co-author of *Die volkseigene Erfahrung: Eine Archäologie des Lebens in der Industrieprovinz der DDR* (1991).

JANET WARD, *Post-Wall Berlin: Borders, Space and Identity* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), xix + 405 pp. ISBN 978 0 230 27657 4. £65.00

The Berlin Wall came down in 1989, but the wall in people's heads is still standing. Janet Ward's new book, *Post-Wall Berlin: Borders, Space and Identity*, can be reduced to this well-worn commonplace, but the American historian is less interested in writing a sentimental lament for a German normality that has still not been found, than in showing that borders are constitutive in the modern and post-modern world. 'Border-making will continue in a post-Wall era because it is, quite simply, a psychological necessity' (p. 18). Inspired by the spatial turn, Ward emphasizes the permanent construction and deconstruction of borders in general, and illustrates this by reference to the specific significance of border-making and border-breaking taking the example of Berlin. The main title, *Post-Wall Berlin*, refers not only to the book's temporal focus, but also has a methodological aspect, in the sense of post-modern theory-building, that aims to make the spatial dimensions of our thinking visible. Finally, in writing this determinedly inter-disciplinary book, Ward's aim is also to overcome the borders between the academic disciplines that deal with the city.

As the author explains in the first part of the book, Berlin has always been a frontier city, a place where borders possess a highly mobilizing and socially shaping force. In transferring Jackson Turner's classic concept of the frontier from the American West to the German East, Ward emphasizes the nature of borders as process. Expansion and migration are therefore an important key to understanding Berlin. Despite her theoretical loans from the post-modern spatial turn, Ward does not close the door to geo-political arguments and problematizes Berlin's role as a turntable between East and West. Since 1989-90, to be sure, the city has exercised this function less in economic terms than in respect of the newly acquired mobility and distinct presence of migrants from Eastern Europe. The fact that this mobility is not unlimited and ends at ever more strongly guarded borders on the new outer limits of Fortress Europe is among Ward's most noteworthy political arguments.

Borders thus continue to exist today, especially after the events of 9/11 which, in many respects, resulted in a strengthening of border regimes and practices of exclusion. Conversely, Ward emphasizes in

the second part of the book, which deals specifically with the Berlin Wall and its afterlives, that all borders are permeable and are shaped, used, and appropriated by the agency of the actors. This applies even to a structure as strongly secured as the Berlin Wall, which she characterizes as a permeable membrane. The Wall also served as an identity resource and a symbolic zipper, separating the two parts while holding them together. The rapid dismantling of the Berlin Wall, however, deprived the Germans of an important anchor for the communicative memory of Germany's division. Ward thus suggests that the 'resurrection' of the Berlin Wall in recent years not only fulfils the expectations of tourists, but is also a reaction to the unsatisfied need for identity felt by Berliners on both sides of the city.<sup>1</sup> Ward does not restrain her criticism of Berlin politics which, she claims, have proved incapable of adequately preserving the Wall as a site of memory as well as the many alternative 'interim uses' of the former death strip.

Ward is also largely critical of Berlin city planning in the 1990s. In the third part of the book, entitled 'German Geomancy: Power and Planning in Berlin', she emphasizes continuities with Albert Speer's megalomaniac planning for 'Germania', but also the contrast between Berlin municipal building surveyor Martin Wagner's (1926–33) forward-looking planning for a world city, and the backward-looking reconstruction undertaken under the aegis of Berlin's building director Hans Stimmann (1991–6 and 1999–2006). The latter was oriented strictly by the historical city plan and traditional local building styles, while the GDR's architectural heritage was pulled down to make way for it. While this commonly heard criticism is understandable, Ward here shows herself to be susceptible to the widespread idealization of Berlin in the 1920s, during the Weimar Republic. On the other hand there is no mention of the basis of Berlin's city development laid down in the 1862 Hobrecht Plan, whose effects are visible to the present day, or of internal and external segregation in the nineteenth-century tenement town. Yet a reflection on the drawing of social boundaries and reactions to it seen in attempts to direct town planning and politics in the twentieth century would have provided a worthwhile longitudinal perspective in a historical and spatial

<sup>1</sup> A similar argument can be found in Hope M. Harrison, 'The Demise and Resurrection of the Berlin Wall: German Debates about the Wall as a Site of Memory', in Birgit Hofmann (ed.), *Diktaturüberwindung in Europa: Neue nationale und transnationale Perspektiven* (Heidelberg, 2010), 195–209.

## Book Reviews

study of Berlin, especially as some of the old socio-spatial patterns have been revived in reunified Berlin.<sup>2</sup>

Ward also argues critically in the fourth part of her study, which looks at the modern memorial architecture in Berlin. In her view, Peter Eisenman's memorial for the murdered Jews of Europe is too large, oversized, and simply old fashioned by comparison with other counter monuments which represent non-traditional, non-state-centred memory. The Berlin Holocaust Memorial, built on contaminated bunker ground and concealed Wall land, is as Ward suggests a wound on the wound and, all in all, a 'tragic comedy of errors' (p. 253). That the memorial does not permit visitors to reflect, and that it is used merely as a 'playground of memory' remain mere assertions, like much in Ward's polarizing arguments. Not Eisenman's field of concrete blocks, she suggests, but Daniel Libeskind's Jewish Museum is the true Holocaust Memorial in Berlin because it relates to its own location more critically, and also points to Jewish life before and after the Holocaust.

In the last section of the book, Ward discusses the reunited capital's dreams of world city status. She tells the story of a grandiose failure, which resulted in acres of office space standing empty, and 62 billion euros of debt. She describes Berlin's city development in the 1990s as a case of 'worst practice urban governance' (p. 287). The historian from Las Vegas, Colorado, labels the New Berlin 'Las Vegas on the Spree', where image is all. The new real estates on Potsdamer Platz, in particular, she sees as standing for the Americanization of the city. Ward describes the re-capitalization of Berlin in a double sense: on the one hand, as a sell-out in the name of democratic, American freedom; on the other, as a failed attempt on the part of Berlin as a new old capital to keep up with other world cities in the global competition. For this reason she demonstrates all the 'castles in the air' dating from the post-*Wende* period that have burst like balloons. And, finally, she predicts a similar fate for Berlin's royal palace, soon to be re-built as the Humboldt Forum.

On the whole, the breadth of publications concerning 'post-Wall Berlin' on which Ward's book draws is impressive. She quotes numerous architects, film makers, and writers as commentators on

<sup>2</sup> See Hartmut Häußermann and Andreas Kapphau, *Berlin: Von der geteilten zur gespaltenen Stadt? Sozialräumlicher Wandel seit 1990* (Opladen, 2000).



the most recent developments in Berlin. But the fact that she repeatedly draws on general reflections of pioneers of the spatial turn, such as Henri Lefebvre and Edward W. Soja, as prophetic forecasts for developments in Berlin, and then uses examples from Berlin to exemplify their theories, gives rise to a circular argument. In general, Ward is interested mainly in the great names of intellectual history from Aristotle to Ernst Bloch, and draws almost exclusively on the work of intellectual critics of the New Berlin. By contrast, we hear little about the actual urban actors, although their agency is repeatedly invoked. The same also applies, ultimately, to the city's spatial structures, which receive uneven treatment in the different chapters. This may be because the individual parts of the book, on the whole, seem quite disparate, sometimes resembling a loose collection of essays. Ward's enjoyment in expressing her opinions is both the strength and the weakness of the book. Thus *Post-Wall Berlin* is ultimately less a sober historiographical analysis written from a distanced perspective than a polemic on the numerous actual or assumed failures of Berlin's development since the *Wende*. The author shows herself to be well informed and always up to date with the most recent, even daily, developments in the debate. The book could thus well be read as a critical travel guide to the New Berlin.

HANNO HOCHMUTH, MA, Research Fellow and Assistant to the Directors at the Zentrum für Zeithistorische Forschung Potsdam, is working on the social history of Berlin in the twentieth century.

## CONFERENCE REPORTS

*Crime and Punishment: Criminal Justice in Modern Europe, 1870-1990.* Conference organized by the German Historical Institute Washington and the German Historical Institute London and held at the GHI Washington, 10-12 Mar. 2011. Conveners: Kerstin Brückweh (GHI London) and Richard F. Wetzell (GHI Washington).

This conference brought together historians working in Belgian, British, French, German, Italian, Russian, Swedish, and Swiss history in order to develop comparative and transnational perspectives on the history of criminal justice in modern Europe since 1870. The first panel sought to provide a transnational perspective on late nineteenth-century criminal justice with papers on international crime, criminal justice in the colonial world, and prison and penal reform. In his paper on the internationalization of crime in Britain and America between 1881 and 1939, Paul Knepper (University of Sheffield) argued that international crime was both more and less than a myth invented by the police. Although the police exaggerated the threat of international crime, they did not invent it; crime became an international issue as a result of 'world-shrinking' technologies of transportation and communication. Yet the police were not the only ones promoting crime as an international problem; many other groups also did so, including the press, politicians, transnational voluntary associations, the League of Nations, and various anti-Semitic conspiracy theorists. Judith Rowbotham (Nottingham Trent University) examined the process of exporting European legal cultures and practices to the colonies. Criticizing the claim that the British Empire created a dualist system that left many indigenous legal structures intact, Rowbotham argued that the British made a concerted effort to crack down on domestic violence in the colonies through the imposition of Western legal norms. The failure of this effort must be explained by a crucial difference between metropole and colonies: whereas in Britain the prosecution of domestic violence

The full conference programme can be found on the GHIL's website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

was part of a wider cultural education, in the colonies the cultural element was lacking.

Andreas Fleiter (University of Bochum) used the concept of legal culture to compare the introduction of probation in the United States and Germany. Whereas the 1878 Massachusetts Probation Act gave the trial court power to suspend sentences on probation, the equivalent Prussian ordinance of 1895 gave this power to the Ministry of Justice, which exercised it in the form of a 'conditional pardon' legitimized by the monarch's prerogative of mercy. Instead of explaining this divergence by a difference in political cultures, Fleiter attributed it primarily to a difference in legal cultures: whereas American criminal procedure distinguished between verdict and sentencing as two distinct phases of the judicial process, in Germany the pronouncement of guilt and punishment were inextricably linked. In the panel's final paper, Tiago Pires Marques (Université Paris-Descartes), used the problem of the 'habitual criminal' as a case study to examine the impact of transnational reform organizations on national penal reforms in the period 1880 to 1940. Stressing the role of the International Penal and Penitentiary Congress (IPPC), Marques argued that the introduction of indeterminate sentencing in continental Europe owed much to the encounter of continental jurists with penal experts from common-law countries (especially Great Britain and the United States), which had pioneered indeterminate sentencing. In her comment, Sylvia Kesper-Biermann (University of Paderborn) encouraged further reflection on how the internationalization of the penal reform movement related to legal reforms within each nation-state. She also called for transnational contacts beyond Europe and the United States to be examined, including the possible effects of the colonial experience on the judicial systems of the metropolitan countries.

The second panel compared the history of penal reform in Britain, Germany, Italy, Switzerland, and Sweden. In a comparative paper, Désirée Schauz (Technical University Munich) and Sabine Freitag (University of Frankfurt am Main) argued that British and German discourses on crime and criminal justice in the period 1870 to 1930 were quite different. In Britain these discourses were dominated by prison commissioners and voluntary societies, while in Germany they were controlled by academic (legal and psychiatric) experts. Whereas the British favoured environmental causes of crime, the

## Conference Reports

Germans focused on biological factors. Finally, only British discussions of crime were embedded in a larger context of political participation, whereas the German discourse was shaped by a belief in scientific progress. Pursuing the history of German penal reform beyond 1933, Greg Eghigian's (Pennsylvania State University) paper on the categorization of offenders criticized the conventional view that the history of modern penal policy 'played out as a choice between punitive retribution and correctional rehabilitation'. Insisting that the two were not mutually exclusive, Eghigian argued that penal policies in Nazi Germany, East Germany, and West Germany were characterized by significant continuities. Although National Socialism became more punitive, it never abandoned its rehabilitative hopes for criminals. After starting out with a class-struggle theory of crime, East German penology came to prioritize the rehabilitation of offenders during the 1960s, while West Germany, too, pursued rehabilitative policies, as evidenced by the introduction of social-therapeutic facilities (*sozialtherapeutische Anstalten*) for sex offenders and 'abnormal' repeat offenders in 1969.

Paul Garfinkel's (Simon Fraser University, Vancouver) paper on penal reform in liberal and fascist Italy challenged the historiographical thesis that Italian penal reform in the period 1880 to 1930 was marked by sharp conflict between the classical and positivist schools of criminal law. Instead, Garfinkel argued that Italian legal culture in this period was unified by broad support for moderate principles of social defence, whose roots he traced back to early nineteenth-century Italian criminal law. The Rocco Code of 1930 was therefore not a compromise between the classical and positivist schools but a 'systematic reworking of moderate penal reform ideas', which was also fully in line with the transnational penal reform movement. In his paper on penal reform in Switzerland in the period 1890 to 1950, Urs Germann (Schweizerisches Bundesarchiv, Berne) argued that the Swiss Criminal Code of 1937 brought about a diversification of sanctions that connected criminal justice to existing regimes of discipline, such as correctional education. Clearly inspired by the international penal reform movement, the code was also shaped by Swiss domestic politics. Robert Andersson (Linnaeus University, Växjö) examined the abandonment of the rehabilitative ideal embodied in Sweden's 1965 penal code in the two following decades. Although academic critiques played a key role in discrediting the rehabilitative ideal,

Sweden's turn toward a criminal justice system based on 'the general sense of justice' disconnected penal policy from any scientific legitimation, thus transforming penal policy from a 'social engineering practice' into a 'moral engineering practice'. In his comment on the panel, Warren Rosenblum (Webster University) encouraged the authors to take into account the role of non-ideological social factors (such as economic depression or full employment) in penal policy. He also underscored the commonalities in the development of penal policy in the countries examined, most of which underwent processes of decarceration and decriminalization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

The third panel examined the criminal trial from a variety of perspectives including the role of juries, forensic expert witnesses, and the press. James M. Donovan (Pennsylvania State University, Mont Alto) used a debate on the jury system between two prominent jurists as a lens to examine the tension between inquisitorial and accusatory elements in French criminal procedure from the French Revolution to the Fifth Republic. The 1955 debate centred on the question of whether France should retain *échevinage* (the association of judges and jurors deliberating and voting together on verdict and punishment), introduced by the Vichy regime in 1941, or return to trial by jury as instituted in 1791. The Code of Criminal Procedure adopted with the advent of the Fifth Republic three years later consolidated the victory of the inquisitorial system over the accusatory principle; *échevinage* was kept, and the presiding judge remained the dominant figure in French criminal trials. Eric J. Engstrom's (Humboldt University, Berlin) paper turned from the role of jurors to that of forensic psychiatrists. Challenging the thesis that the increasing role played by forensic psychiatrists had resulted in a medicalization of criminal justice in Imperial Germany, Engstrom examined an array of jurisdictional conflicts between psychiatry and jurisprudence, including conflicts over forensic expertise in court, the placement of mentally ill criminals, and forensic psychiatric training, in order to present a more complex picture of the relationship between psychiatry and criminal justice. John Carter Wood (Institute of European History, Mainz) used a British murder trial of 1928 as a case study to examine the role of the media in criminal trials. In their reporting, Wood argued, the press placed increasing emphasis on expert witnesses such as detectives and pathologists, but also expanded their

## Conference Reports

reporting beyond the courtroom to cover crime scenes and pretrial investigations. Newspaper crime reporting also contributed to celebrity culture and provided opportunities for the discussion of broader social and cultural issues.

Continuing the third panel, Sace Elder (Eastern Illinois University) examined Wilhelmine Germany's renegotiation of the limits of acceptable adult violence against children. Starting with a 1907 case of child abuse that became a nationwide scandal, Elder analysed the public, legal, and parliamentary debates that weighed parental rights against the rights of children and resulted in the passage of Germany's first anti-cruelty law in 1912. The panel's final paper, by Dominique Grisard (University of Basel), examined the 1973 trial of a left-wing male terrorist in a Swiss court in order to tease out the gendering of judicial narratives. The court's judgment, she argued, alternated between a 'narrative of rationality', which was necessary to create a threat scenario as the basis for conviction, and a 'narrative of dilettantism', which denied the defendant the attributes of hegemonic masculinity by depoliticizing the crime and pathologizing the defendant. In her comment on this panel, Rebekka Habermas (University of Göttingen) noted that all the papers shared a conception of legal culture as part of the broader culture, but nevertheless encouraged the authors to pay more attention to the interactive dynamics between criminal trials and various external factors. To what extent, for instance, were trials both shaped by, and an influence on, penal reform? To what extent did the press create events?

The conference's fourth and final panel was devoted to the history of prisons and other penal institutions. Mary Gibson's (John Jay College, City University of New York) paper on prisons in nineteenth-century Italy revised the conventional narrative of Italian prison history, which stresses the modernization and secularization of prisons after the unification of Italy, by revealing stark differences between the treatment of male and female prisoners in post-unification Italy. Whereas men's prisons were increasingly constructed and administered according to modern penological principles, women's prisons were managed by religious orders, who submitted female prisoners to a regime that stressed moral and religious reform. Since this private monastic model was clearly at odds with the principles of the liberal Italian state, it also demonstrates that women were not perceived as citizens. Turning from Italy to Belgium, Bert Vanhulle

(Catholic University of Louvain) and Margo De Koster (Catholic University of Louvain) challenged the conventional division of the history of Belgian prisons into two distinct periods: the era of the 'moral prison' (c.1850–80), during which Belgium implemented the 'cellular system' to facilitate the moral improvement of inmates, and the subsequent transformation of Belgian prisons into science-based institutions committed to a medicalized approach to crime and criminals. Although Vanhulle and De Koster acknowledged that there was a discursive shift from a moral to a medical discourse from the 1880s onwards, they argued that this shift was not neatly reflected in penal practice, which revealed a great deal of continuity and a fusion of different approaches throughout the period 1850 to 1940. Just as prison practices prior to 1880 were already undergoing a process of medicalization, so the supposedly scientific practices after 1880 still reflected many of the old moral categories. Moving further into the twentieth century, Roddy Nilsson's (Linnaeus University, Växjö) paper on the transformation of the Swedish prison system from the 1930s to the 1960s also identified a significant gap between discourse and practice. Although Swedish prison reformers in this period talked about constructing a prison system built on the principles of individual prevention, treatment, and humanism, much of this remained just talk. The prison system never received sufficient material resources to implement the reforms. It lacked professionally educated personnel, and the enormous energy expended on creating diagnostic tools to assess prisoners stood in sharp contrast to the very limited interest in developing treatment programmes.

The panel's last two papers explored penal institutions other than the prison. Stephen A. Toth (Arizona State University) examined the Contard Affair of 1909, in which the suicide of a male youth interned in the Maison Paternelle, a private establishment for recalcitrant bourgeois youths, resulted in a trial of the Maison's director for wrongful imprisonment. The trial, he argued, led to a far-reaching reassessment of private power, state control, and paternal authority in *fin de siècle* France. Although the director was acquitted, the trial sealed the fate of the Maison Paternelle and other private institutions of this kind, as the French state asserted its pre-eminent role in dealing with troubled youths. Three years later, France established a separate juvenile court system, which mandated psychiatric examinations. Sarah Badcock (University of Nottingham) explored the lived

## Conference Reports

experiences of convicts who were exiled to Eastern Siberia in late Imperial Russia. Badcock found that the state played only a minimal part in determining conditions in exile, where convicts were supposed to make a living off the land. Because of the lack of state involvement, conditions for criminal exiles were often worse than conditions in Russian prisons. Since the mostly male convicts were frequently accompanied by their families, the line between punishment and the suffering of innocents was often blurred, giving rise to a sense of arbitrariness. In his comment on the panel, Pieter Spierenburg (Erasmus University, Rotterdam) insisted on the need to distinguish between medical metaphors and the application of medical techniques in nineteenth-century penology. He also encouraged the authors to think about the implications of Norbert Elias's theory of the long-term diminution of power differences (between men and women, parents and children, prisoners and guards, for instance) for the history of criminal justice.

The conference was characterized by lively exchange and discussion. The final discussion identified a number of common themes. First, many of the papers challenged narratives of rupture and stressed long-term continuities. Second, many authors called into question accounts that focused on conflicts between different juridical schools, arguing instead that reforms were made possible by a widespread consensus among criminal jurists. Third, taken together, the examinations of national criminal justice histories revealed a remarkable transnational consensus on penal reform, especially around the turn of the century. Fourth, while everyone has long been critical of Whiggish narratives of progress in the history of criminal justice, most of the authors were equally critical of teleological narratives of scientization, medicalization, and social control. In the final discussion, there was also a near-consensus that it was important to examine both ideas and practices without establishing a hierarchy between the two. While much remains to be done—suggestions for topics to be studied ranged from the history of risk management to the history of emotions—there was a strong sense that the national histories of criminal justice have reached a stage at which the comparative and transnational perspectives that were central to this conference are extremely fruitful for advancing the field.

RICHARD F. WETZELL (GHI Washington)



*The Dilemmas of International Humanitarian Aid in the Twentieth Century.* Conference organized as part of the Gerda Henkel Visiting Professorship jointly established at the German Historical Institute London and the International History Department of the London School of Economics and Political Science, held at the GHIL, 12–14 May 2011.

The conference addressed fundamental dilemmas of international humanitarian aid. Covering the history of humanitarian aid from the beginning of the twentieth century to the present, it highlighted historical conjunctures such as wars and post-war periods, empires and decolonization, which contributed to the emergence of global humanitarianism as we know it today. It encompassed European, Western, and non-Western perspectives. The conference was attended by international scholars of history, political science, media studies, and anthropology. The convener Johannes Paulmann (first incumbent of the Gerda Henkel Visiting Professorship in 2009/10, now Director of the Leibniz Institute of European History, Mainz) introduced the conference by explaining the term and concept of humanitarian aid. He argued in favour of a broad understanding which allows scholars to capture historical developments and fundamental dilemmas. He surveyed a field of equivalent terms and neighbouring concepts from 'relief' and 'rehabilitation' to 'development aid' and 'foreign aid'. Around this array of terms were several ideas which motivated those who provide humanitarian aid: 'charity', 'humanity', 'solidarity', 'civilizing mission', 'modernization', and 'global justice'. The aim of the conference was not to come up with a clear-cut definition of humanitarian aid, but to investigate a complex field and to analyse the strategic uses which aid agencies, governments, recipients of aid, and academics made of the various terms and concepts.

#### *Multiple Foundations of International Humanitarianism*

One of the foundations of humanitarianism lies in colonial settings. Vincent Viaene (Brasenose College, Oxford) outlined the internation-

The full conference programme can be found on the GHIL's website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

## Conference Reports

al campaigns against abuses in the Belgian Congo from the 1870s to the 1900s by focusing on the role of religious internationalism. He demonstrated that Catholic, Protestant, and Islamic activists moved within the context of imperial and national power relations. Two types of humanitarian action may be distinguished. One was based on mass mobilization and a repertoire of sentimental rhetoric and drama; the other relied on expert witnesses and prose combined with lobbying parliament, the press, and politicians. The first type is best exemplified by the resurgent anti-slavery movement in 1888-90, pushed by the papacy and Cardinal Lavigerie of the White Fathers. The Catholic anti-slavery campaign gained its fervour from both the advance of Islam in neighbouring Sudan and the European culture wars with liberalism. The increased emphasis on 'humanity' as a battle cry derived from specific Christian and Catholic purposes. It ultimately served the consolidation and expansion of colonial rule in the Free State. After 1890 a different type of humanitarian movement critical of colonial practices in the Congo emerged. The Aborigines Protection Society (APS) and the Congo Reform Association (CRA) were instrumental in making public such abuses as forced labour and bodily mutilations. They efficiently combined expert witnessing to parliament, government, and the press with mobilizing empathy among the public at large. Photography as 'incorruptible' evidence reduced the complexities of the Congo system to key symbols of abuse.

Matthias Schulz (University of Geneva) explained another essential humanitarian tradition, namely, the Red Cross movement which had made the call for humanity at times of war its core feature since the 1860s. Empathy for the suffering of human beings, *realpolitik*, and new forms of internationalism all contributed to its peculiar nature. Schulz emphasized the crucial role of governments. He contended that neither utilitarian arguments for getting wounded soldiers back into battle nor the ideas of reciprocity and humanitarian commitment were decisive. Indeed, the adoption of humanitarian norms took hold in each European country under specific circumstances and for particular reasons. National associations strengthened patriotism and contributed to the militarization of civil society, while the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) advanced the development of the international humanitarian law of war. Schulz recognized a major limitation in the deliberate decision by the ICRC to restrict itself to aid at times of war rather than to expand into

*The Dilemmas of International Humanitarian Aid*

peacetime activities during civil emergencies. As a consequence, the international Red Cross for a long time did not become a source of transnational solidarity. It was only in the aftermath of the First World War and in cooperation with private voluntary organizations and the League of Nations that the international Red Cross movement slowly extended its reach beyond the care of soldiers.

Apart from colonialism and war, religious organizations provided a third source of humanitarianism. Among them, the Society of Friends played a prominent part in internationalizing humanitarianism. Daniel Maul (University of Gießen) analysed the period from 1890 to the end of the First World War when the Quakers' relief work among victims of war and natural disasters became more professional. The tradition of experiencing and worshipping God through 'testimonies' offers only a partial explanation. By highlighting tensions inherent in their motives and comparing British and American Friends, Maul identified specific national and international factors which drove this development. A broader engagement in foreign relief emerged from the Young Friends Movement towards the end of the nineteenth century. The younger Friends shared a zeal for reform with other youth movements of the time. They also responded to the challenge posed by growing evangelical movements in the Christian world. The First World War confronted the Friends with the problem of how to reconcile their belief in peace with patriotic duties. Non-combatant service units offered an answer during the war. Afterwards, large-scale relief operations were regarded as necessary works of reconciliation and education for peace. Generational impetus and war-related issues were common problems on both sides of the Atlantic. Differences in other areas illustrate that transnational relief networks were also firmly embedded in national cultures. While foreign aid was quickly established among all Friends in Britain, young American Quakers active in this field remained an independent group outside official religious structures because no overall consensus existed on its desirability for the Society of Friends. Americans therefore had a greater need to emphasize professionalism, and they showed more caution in regard to cooperation with others.

## Conference Reports

### *Humanitarianism in the Shadow of Colonialism and World Wars*

The American Red Cross became involved in child welfare programmes in Russia towards the end of the First World War and during the revolutionary period. Jennifer Polk (University of Toronto) demonstrated that the Red Cross agents and official diplomatic observers were well aware of ulterior motives. In Petrograd the programme aimed to keep Russia in the war against Germany and Austria-Hungary; it sought to stabilize the Provisional Government and generally strengthen Russo-American relations. During the Allied intervention in 1918–19 the relief operations in effect served to protect military stores, thereby indirectly reinforcing military efforts against the Bolshevik government. Much more than the ICRC, the American Red Cross pursued an openly political agenda. Humanitarian aid was, at the same time, imbued with a somewhat naive belief in its effectiveness regarding education for democracy and the long-term friendship nourished by the provision of food to children.

Colonial rule elsewhere continued to frame humanitarian aid between the wars. The violent conflict in northern Morocco between the Berber population and the Spanish colonial army in the early 1920s gave rise to civilian casualties, mass killings, guerrilla tactics, air and gas warfare, hostage taking, and famine. Francisco Javier Martínez-Antonio (Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales, CSIC, Madrid) analysed attempts to mobilize aid in terms of competing nationalism and restricted internationalism. Each of the parties involved—Spanish, French, and Moroccan—sought to raise funds and, at the same time, to prevent others from intervening on humanitarian grounds. International aid was obstructed, especially the activities of the International Committee of the Red Cross. The ICRC was first of all limited by its dependence on national Red Cross societies and the principle of sovereignty imbedded in its norms. The Spanish government, by framing the conflict in terms of ‘police operations’ against ‘rebels’, was able to prevent the Rifians from establishing a Red Cross society. It also effectively stopped the French Red Cross from acting as the agent of neutral humanitarian intervention. The Rifian belligerents, as the weakest player, hoped to obtain international recognition indirectly by involving the ICRC for their own political purposes. Their leader, Abd el-Krim, manipulated interna-

tional opinion by exaggerating the suffering of the civilian population and by showing foreign journalists around. The Rifian army, indeed, kept some of the food deliveries for their soldiers instead of distributing them to the needy. In conclusion, Martínez-Antonio emphasized the restrictions placed on international activities in a military conflict overshadowed by colonial rule.

Asymmetries also had a role in other parts of the world. The antagonism between China and the Western powers over the question of China's ability to govern itself after the First World War was played out not only in diplomatic circles but also in the field of humanitarian relief. Caroline Reeves (Emmanuel College, Boston) illustrated an American 'humanitarian imperialism' in her analysis of a prominent incident in 1923. A luxury train carrying wealthy foreign and Chinese passengers was hijacked by bandits who took the passengers hostage for five weeks. The widely publicized incident instigated relief efforts by the Chinese Red Cross and the American Red Cross (ARC), with the latter's China Central Committee running operations. The presence of the ARC's China Committee was in clear breach of international Red Cross policy not to establish or maintain RC societies in foreign countries. It reflected the ARC's expansive campaign in China and, indeed, undermined the position of the existing Chinese Red Cross. The ARC field representatives sought to furnish the Chinese with 'a model of proper and effective Red Cross activity' by taking a 'business-like' understanding of humanitarianism to its Chinese counterpart, which, contrary to evidence, was deemed in need of such development aid. This kind of civilizing mission in humanitarian disguise, Reeves contended, seriously undermined the considerable efforts which had been made since 1904-5 to develop Chinese philanthropy along Western lines. Building on established charitable traditions in the country, the Chinese Red Cross styled itself a modern innovation. It established international ties, advertised its national scope and the use of modern technology, and displayed a military image. The Lincheng incident of 1923 highlighted the contradictory nature of American humanitarian involvement abroad. It robbed the Chinese Red Cross of stature in the international community and the local arena.

Foreign activities in Greece and Asia Minor during the early 1920s illustrate the consequences for humanitarian aid in the context of complex emergencies in which an immediate crisis is linked by

## Conference Reports

armed conflicts to a partial breakdown of societal coping mechanisms and state authority. Relief quickly ran into dilemmas, solutions to which were contested between and within the various non-governmental and state actors. Davide Rodogno (Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva) investigated the thin line between short-term relief and medium-term rehabilitation. After the defeat of the Greek army in Asia Minor, the city of Smyrna became the centre of a refugee crisis in 1922. A division over long-term aims existed among diplomatic agents, relief administrators, missionaries, and merchants. Some favoured the ethnic and religious diversity of the former Ottoman Empire and for reasons of economic vitality preferred solutions for the Greek refugees within Turkey. Others regarded Turkey as a victim of the European powers and blamed the Greek government for its alignment with British interests. They saw the Greek population as an obstacle to Turkish development and therefore favoured its departure to the European continent. With the outbreak of fire in Smyrna in September 1922 the question was resolved in an emergency by the men and women on the spot who favoured massive evacuation. The local 'solution' in Asia Minor led to a local 'dilemma' elsewhere once the refugees arrived in Greece. The ICRC delegate in Greece, Rudolph de Reding, quickly sought to expand international activities beyond the traditional sphere. He developed the idea of *colonisation agricole* for the refugees on uncultivated land in Macedonia. The Geneva headquarters viewed this 'solution' with suspicion. De Reding, however personally crossed the line from relief to rehabilitation. In 1923 he became one of the League of Nations' experts on the 'exchange of populations', when he joined the League's Refugee Resettlement Commission which opened a new phase in humanitarian relief.

International humanitarian agents cooperated regularly, but rivalries were just as common, even between familial organizations. Irène Hermann (University of Fribourg) and Daniel Palmieri (University of Geneva/ ICRC) described the intense struggle within the Red Cross movement between the Swedish and Swiss Red Cross Societies and the ICRC during operations in Greece between 1941 and 1945. From the outset, the apparent cooperation was riddled by Swiss and Swedish tensions which partially stemmed from a decision taken by the British government. After agreeing to lift its blockade for relief operations, it insisted that practical implementation should be in the

hands of a neutral third party. London opted for the Swedish Red Cross to become the responsible agent because it considered the ICRC to be on 'too good terms with the occupying powers'. Tensions gained additional force from the national interests pursued by Sweden through its humanitarian commitment. The involvement was seen as a means of enhancing its standing in relation to Britain and was also motivated by opening market outlets for Swedish business in the post-war future. Nor, on the other hand, was the ICRC a purely charitable organization. The close personal ties between its members, the Swiss Red Cross, and the Swiss government allowed motives of self-interest to enter its dealings. Hermann and Palmieri concluded that the neutral governments attempted to regain and strengthen their international standing through activities in humanitarian relief after they had been criticized by the Allies for their economic arrangements with the Axis powers.

Originally providing crisis relief to children in countries suffering from war and its aftermath, the Save the Children International Union (SCIU), founded in 1920, developed into an expert international organization concerned with long-term welfare for children. Joelle Droux (University of Geneva) explored the ways in which the Union adapted its aims and practices in changing historical circumstances, especially during and after the Second World War. The transformation was a difficult process in which the International Union faced challenges in terms of its organizational structure, competition with other agencies, and clarification of its aims. By the mid 1920s, the SCIU had already claimed two different mandates; one for coordinating emergency relief in humanitarian crises, the other as an expert body for child welfare. The Second World War severely disrupted the mechanisms of transnational coordination used by the SCIU, that is, the circulation of information, people, and material, with the result that it was endangered by lack of funds, connections, and purpose. Between 1944 and 1947, the International Union finally turned from a relief agency for children into an international centre of expertise for the protection of children and young people, becoming part of a network of medical, educational, and judicial experts. And it established closer links with non-European partners, partly leaving its European origins behind. In the process, SCIU had to drop its universal ambitions and become a more focused and specialized agency.

## Conference Reports

Heide Fehrenbach (Northern Illinois University) located the origins of international adoption in international humanitarian social work after the First World War, here directed at refugee and migrant families. In the decades up to 1960 two strands of transformation took place, leading to distinct cultures of inter-country adoption. One was characterized by professionalization and an attempt to set international standards for procedures which aimed to make the welfare of the child paramount while preserving the rights of birth parents. This formed part of the emergence of international organizations and governance structures. The principal agents involved were the International Social Service (ISS) and later the United Nations. ISS was a non-governmental organization initiated by female social workers in 1919, targeting refugee emergencies in the aftermath of the war. As a response to the problems in several countries with war orphans and illegitimate or fatherless children after 1945, the principle focus began to change from reuniting separated families to 'creating' new families through inter-country adoption. The ISS became the primary non-sectarian organization for handling international adoption in the United States, Western Europe, and East Asia.

A different mode of adoption grew out of interrelated strands in the media, military occupation, and Christian works. While the ISS was an expert organization with few links to the media, this second, less formal, pattern was closely connected to visual media images, creating moral communities among viewers. In the United States two specific groups took up the cause of suffering children abroad. First, the African American press focused on institutional racism in Germany, directed against the children fathered by black American soldiers. Adoption by American families seemed a good solution to the assumed individual needs and a matter of civil rights. The creation of new families by inter-country adoption also guided the hands-on Christian humanitarian activism practised by evangelical Christians. This kind of 'moral witnessing' increasingly focused on Asia during the late 1940s and 1950s, advocating the adoption of children from China and Korea. Evangelical Christians, celebrities, and military personnel lobbied to liberalize immigration law in order to help suffering children find a new home and family in the United States. Thus, Fehrenbach concluded, two distinct approaches emerged: an expert culture of international social work and governance by international organizations; and a humanitarian commitment by various



### *The Dilemmas of International Humanitarian Aid*

religious, ethnic, and social groups relying on emotional appeal and the media for its purposes.

The establishment of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) has often been described as a crucial step in professionalizing global humanitarianism. Silvia Salvatici (University of Teramo, Italy) proposed a more complex evaluation. The main task of UNRRA's 'gigantic humanitarian crusade' between 1944 and 1947 was the relief and rehabilitation of Displaced Persons in Austria, Italy, and, above all, Germany. Its welfare work in the camps covered a wide range of activities from housing, feeding, and clothing to education, training, employment, recreation, and entertainment. Rehabilitation entailed a definition of the refugees' needs in both general and specific terms, for example, for mothers, children, or the sick. Salvatici argued that conceptualizing DPs as people in need labelled them as recipients; it mirrored the self-perception of UNRRA officers as rescuers who were thereby constructing their own collective identity. The description by UNRRA workers of the 'beneficiaries' as 'apathetic', or, in the case of mothers, as 'lacking a sense of maternal feeling', reflected their ideal of an active person. As welfare officers thought they knew better than the DPs, conflicts often erupted. The very idea of helping 'the people help themselves', which UNRRA described as its principle, can thus be seen very much in terms of constructing needs, despite existing coping mechanisms on the part of those receiving aid. Salvatici concluded that, if the aftermath of the Second World War was indeed a founding moment of contemporary humanitarianism, its techniques drew strongly on the humanitarianism of the inter-war period. It had entailed dilemmas of varying standards, contradictory practices, and the inadequate construction of identities both of relief workers and persons in need.

### *Humanitarianism at the Intersection of the Cold War and Decolonization*

Humanitarianism after 1945 developed at the intersection of decolonization and the Cold War. Shobana Shankar (Georgetown University, Washington DC) explained how, by the end of the 1950s, African children had become the subject of humanitarian intervention by UNICEF. She demonstrated that this was a process of transition from one kind of international actor, Christian missions, to

## Conference Reports

another secular one, UNICEF, accompanied by the construction of African 'problems'. Practices and discourses pioneered by missionaries were overlaid with new justifications and activities, particularly of a technical and scientific nature. UNICEF's work relied on the existing structures of Christian orphanages, schools, and hospitals and on informal networks of cooperation. It also built on the previous construction of needs. By 1952 UNICEF began to give priority to fighting disease, shifting away from its earlier focus on nutrition. Shankar identified the principal means by which UNICEF established itself in Africa in the construction of Africa as a continent of disease, which built on previous leprosy missions, and its emphasis on medical science. The late 1940s and the 1950s proved a major turning point in humanitarian relief before the formal end of colonialism.

In the wider context of international relations in the 1950s and 1960s, the example of the Franco-Algerian war exemplifies the emergence of an international humanitarian regime at the intersection between the Cold War and decolonization. Young-sun Hong (Harvard University/State University of New York, Stony Brook) argued that the architecture of the post-war humanitarian regime was determined by the domestic and geopolitical needs of the Western powers. The 1949 Geneva Conventions and the 1951 UN Refugee Convention as well as cultural and racial beliefs in Western superiority and continued civilizing mission buffered structural blindness to the humanitarian dimensions of de-colonization. A case in point was the struggle over assistance during the Franco-Algerian war (1954-62). Hong compared the debate about aid to refugees in Northern Africa with the assistance given to Hungarians fleeing the Soviet invasion in 1956 and the disregard for international law during the Suez crisis. Ideologically determined inequalities and the instrumental use of humanitarian aid for other purposes by the French authorities in Algeria thus became apparent. This was mirrored by another less than selfless practical commitment to solidarity with the Algerian National Liberation Front (FLN) on the part of the Soviet Union and its allies. The conflict waged in terms of aid was made more complicated by divergent aims within both blocs and among Third World countries, and by the interactive process in which, over the years, 'donors' competed with each other, often disappointing the 'beneficiaries'. As a result, expected political benefits were often not achieved.

*The Dilemmas of International Humanitarian Aid*

The Nigerian–Biafran war has long been regarded as a key event in the history of humanitarian aid. Konrad Kuhn (University of Zurich) analysed its impact along with the protests against the building of the Cahora Bassa dam in colonial Mozambique a few years later. He regarded the discussion on both incidents as part of a general search for new forms of politics in the late 1960s. Protests and activities in the global North were closely linked with events and perceptions of the global South. The famine in the secessionist province of Biafra stirred public opinion in many Western countries when images of starving children were used in a deliberate propaganda effort by Biafra’s almost defeated military leadership. A multitude of action groups emerged, especially among students, doctors, and the churches. The appeal in the West was based on general humanitarian grounds but also on the fact that the Biafran Ibo were Christian, while the government was dominated by the Muslim Hausa. Support for Biafra was rarely explicitly political. By contrast, protests against the building of the Cahora Bassa dam were political from the start. The hydro-electric plant was part of a larger development plan to bolster Portuguese colonial rule in Mozambique. Protest movements emerged in several European countries, especially in 1969–70. Declaring solidarity with the liberation movement FRELIMO, the Western groups denounced governments for their cooperation in granting export loans and guarantees, and banks and large engineering corporations such as Siemens for upholding late colonialism. Information spread among Western initiatives, and between FRELIMO and its European supporters, thus opening an avenue of communication which had not been available before. In a way, the dam project thus also proved a valuable propaganda object for its opponents. The two cases of Biafra and Cahora Bassa illustrate the different ways in which social movements in Europe and North America analysed, constructed, and contested humanitarianism in the context of a global North and South.

While Biafra created lasting images of starvation in Africa, Cahora Bassa politicized economic and political relations with the ‘Third World’ and was seen as a concrete example of imperialism and dependency theory. Florian Hannig (University of Halle-Wittenberg) explained how relief measures could themselves become politicized. A cyclone hit the shores of East Pakistan in November 1970; shortly thereafter, tensions between East and West Pakistan culminated in a

## Conference Reports

civil war and the eastern part declared its independence as Bangladesh. By the end of the year 10 million people had fled to India while another 30 million were displaced within Bangladesh. Despite international pressure, Islamabad declared the war to be an internal matter and refused access to humanitarian groups. Omega, a radical non-governmental group, undercut this by deliberately blurring the distinction between humanitarianism and politics which other organizations accepted. Their urge to act was based on a simplified view of the complexities and an interpretation of the crisis in terms of a 'David v. Goliath' narrative. This perception rested on lessons which members of the group thought they had learnt from the Nigerian-Biafran War. Operation Omega combined traditional relief measures with symbolic politics. One team was sent across the border to distribute aid, while a second team, equipped with token relief supplies, staged a sit-in inside Bangladesh, and had itself arrested in August 1971. Foreign governments and media had been informed in advance. Humanitarian relief missions themselves, Hannig argued, thus became a means of political communication. The small operation undertaken by Omega may therefore be seen as one example of new forms of political participation in the 1970s, which aimed to change the public agenda by using media events to mobilize protest against traditional patterns of politics in the name of wider, fundamental aims.

The refugee crisis of the late 1970s and 1980s in South-East Asia led to confrontations between established and new forms of humanitarian aid which were played out between competing organizations. Michael Vössing (University of Mannheim) looked at relations between the West German Red Cross Society and the Committee Cap Anamur, founded in 1979 by the journalist Rupert Neudeck, inspired by Bernard Kouchner, André Gluckmann, and the French rescue ship *Ile de Lumière*. The leading figures of the Red Cross and Cap Anamur clashed at home. Both organizations created a public image of themselves by denigrating the other. This appeared to be a conflict between an established, neutral organization close to state and government on the one hand, and a committed, flexible newcomer based on civic support on the other. The clash can be explained by the competition, first, over government support—diplomatic, organizational, and partly financial—and, secondly, over funding through public campaigns. The West German public, however, was apparently concerned less

### *The Dilemmas of International Humanitarian Aid*

about the organizational struggle than whether 'Asian' refugees should be brought into Germany. The Secretary-General of the Red Cross published several newspaper articles in 1980-1 demanding strict limits on immigration through the 'humanitarian' backdoor. Vössing showed that a remarkable number of people felt impelled to protest against Red Cross collections in writing because they opposed immigration, notwithstanding that the Red Cross, unlike Cap Anamur, did not ship Vietnamese refugees to West Germany, but provided aid on the spot in Asia. The West German conflicts in general illustrate that the dividing line between old and new, state and non-state actors was not clear-cut and less important than governance between several agents.

### *Dilemmas of Global Humanitarianism*

Internationally, Médecins sans Frontières (MSF), officially founded in 1971, is generally regarded as the hallmark of a new paradigm of international humanitarianism. Set against the dominance of the 'conservative' Red Cross, it has been portrayed as more engaged, more outspoken, and more willing to use the media and public opinion for its humanitarian purposes. The foundation myth relates to the experience of the Biafran war when a group of committed doctors broke with the ICRC policy of confidentiality and discretion. The act of 'witnessing' (*témoignage*) therefore became a key feature. Looking at neglected aspects of the origins of MSF, Michal Givoni (University of California, Berkeley) re-investigated the advent of the 'expert witness' and the role of ethical reflexivity in humanitarian governance up to the 1990s. In addition to the 'Biafran' doctors, a second group of physicians was involved in the foundation of MSF. At the core of their initiative was medical ethical responsibility, which they saw as endangered by an increasingly bureaucratic, commercialized, and technical approach to medicine. Givoni argued that relief missions in the third world offered an opportunity for a genuine re-enchantment of the profession. Accordingly, in its first years MSF served as a placement agency, matching development and humanitarian organizations with French doctors willing to spend some time in the Third World. *Témoignage*, for the most part, remained a personal act; only with the MSF protest against the misuse of humanitarian aid in

## Conference Reports

Ethiopia in 1985 and its withdrawal, for similar reasons, from Hutu refugee camps after the Rwanda genocide in 1994, did *témoignage* become reflexive and transform the cultivation of subjectivity by individual experts into a mode mobilizing private experts as a prime resource for the deployment of efficient political power on a global scale. *Témoignage* was a mechanism for translating moral claims into political action and vice versa. It changed relations between the humanitarian and the political, bringing them closer together while still keeping them apart.

Historical research on humanitarian aid has focused on organizations, politics, and discourses. The anthropologist Eva Spies (University of Mainz) changed the perspective by looking at the intercultural configuration in which European development workers find themselves on the spot. She analysed the situation in terms of intercultural encounters. The resulting dilemmas can be described using the notion of 'participating development'. In practice, a 'participatory' mode results in a conundrum for those who try to follow it because it contains conflicting demands. 'Participation' proves to be an ambiguous concept; differences need to be accepted and used as an asset for sustained development while it also appears necessary to minimize differences in order to facilitate the process. Men and women on the spot cope with the dilemma in several different ways. One is to seek a consensus with locals. Despite best intentions, this often results in disputes because local counterparts appear not to accept the 'Western' mode of establishing consensus. Instead, they adopt a mode of situational negotiation of interests trying not to let the opposite partner gain advantage over them. Other ways of coping with the participatory dilemma are to withdraw from contacts or reduce them to a necessary minimum, muddling through, and cynicism. The pitfalls of 'participatory development' illustrate that everyday problems of interpersonal and intercultural interaction help in the understanding of general problems of development aid.

In emergencies similar issues arise from intercultural encounters, but they are even more pressing compared to those in development. While standards for the improvement of humanitarian aid are constantly under review, very few aid workers benefit from training. Anicée van Engeland (University of Exeter) discussed the dilemmas faced when international guidelines need to be applied in different cultural contexts. The case of Islam illustrates the difficulty of adapt-

ing humanitarian response tools to a particular religious or cultural system. The pressing nature of an emergency often allows little time to adapt to local contexts. Humanitarian organizations have responded differently to the dilemma. The ICRC provides advance cultural training for its aid workers; Médecins sans Frontières hires consultants for debriefing. Others consider the urgency of helping more important than the local context and make no special provisions. Van Engeland, who has been a consultant for humanitarian organizations, explained how the delivery of medical support can actually improve if aid workers take local contexts properly into consideration.

Several Asian countries have changed their position from aid recipients to aid providers in the past decades. Alain Guilloux (City University Hong Kong), a former board member and CEO of MSF, asked why most Asian countries were reluctant to endorse the post-Second World War humanitarian order. He argued that this was the legacy of colonialism, the Western dominance of the United Nations Organization, the Cold War, interventionism, and, finally, the distribution and balance of power between the middle powers and frustrated great powers in Asia. Another crucial period in the history of humanitarian governance began with the end of the Cold War. This period has been characterized by reduced protection for internal refugees and war victims. Further, the regional security arrangements of the Cold War have not been replaced by new ones, and no adequate regional institutions have been developed to respond to either natural or man-made disasters. Guilloux contended that this apparent reluctance may well be broken down in future by democratization and economic development in Asian countries. If countries such as China see their trade interests endangered by instability caused by humanitarian disasters such as that in the Horn of Africa, giving aid in some form may be a rational option.

More recent changes in satellite TV, global all-news networks, and the internet have radically altered the number and character of international actors engaged in humanitarian aid. Eytan Gilboa (Bar-Ilan University and University of Southern California) systematically explored the role of the media from a historical and theoretical perspective. On the one hand, the media routinely covers major crises and disasters. On the other, journalists and news organizations intervene by organizing campaigns, usually for humanitarian aid. Media coverage and intervention therefore present journalists and editors

## Conference Reports

with a professional dilemma if they wish to adhere to norms such as balanced, fair, and neutral reporting. In a theoretical perspective, recent changes in the role of the media in humanitarian aid have been analysed by using concepts drawn from international relations and communications studies. These include the concept of 'soft power', that is, the pursuit of power politics by humanitarianism, the so-called 'CNN effect', which holds that pictures of humanitarian disasters force governments into action, and, finally, 'framing' theory, used to analyse the discourse 'battles' among aid organizations, governments, and victims' representatives over the legitimacy and usefulness of international humanitarian aid. These three approaches, Gilboa concluded, need to be critically applied so that they yield historical insights and improve theoretical concepts for the changing role of media in humanitarian aid.

Concluding the conference, Johannes Paulmann identified essential dilemmas, inherent or apparent, in the idea and practice of international humanitarian aid, which have shaped the field since the beginning of the twentieth century. (1) *Spectatorship and Agency*. The distance of those who suffer carried inherent tensions. It determined the capacity of those who watched others suffer to help, and it opened a fundamental gap between spectatorship and agency. (2) *Media Intervention*. Distance resulted in the construction of similarities and/or otherness. There was a need to translate between abstract universalism and local peculiarities. Media intervention has therefore always been a basic feature of humanitarian action, although relations with the aid agencies varied at specific times. (3) *The Politics of Empathy*. Narratives of suffering and relief often focused on events and actions. As a consequence of an alarmist and dramatized picture the political or structural causes of suffering were often left out. Human empathy appeared in the foreground and was used by some of the political actors in disasters, so that we can speak of the politics of empathy. (4) *Humanitarian Aid as Politics*. Humanitarian aid was often used as an instrument to achieve other ends. In foreign aid it became an instrument of foreign policy. It was also part of some governments' economic policy because aid products such as food helped their own producers. Domestic politics in donor and receiving countries determined the size, timing, and geography of aid, while international relations affected who helped, to what extent, and for how long. Humanitarian aid as politics also touched on the fundamental



*The Dilemmas of International Humanitarian Aid*

question of the relationship between civil society and the state. (5) *The Politics of Aid*. As a result of proliferation and competition, aid organizations pursued their own politics. One basic feature was the relationship between the international dimension of aid and the national aid structures in donor countries. Multi-layered systems of humanitarian aid existed and we need to ask how the aid polity developed over time nationally and internationally, for example, through the League of Nations and the United Nations Organization. Another factor was the competition between NGOs over funds, access, and publicity. (6) *Outside Intervention and Local Coping Mechanisms*. A final dilemma pertained to the relationship between donors and beneficiaries. What were the effects of moral, economic, political, military, or cultural interventions on the existing coping mechanisms of societies struck by disaster? Negative results were, for example, the prolongation of war and support for authoritarian regimes. Humanitarian aid, on the other hand, also strengthened the agency of the beneficiaries individually and, in some cases, collectively.

Overall, the conference explored the history of humanitarian aid in a polycentric, multi-layered manner from the point of view of Europe and the West, from the colonies and the Third World, and from local/national and international perspectives, revealing uneven development and contingencies of change. Emphasis was put on the coming together of different forces, events, and structures at particular times explaining the dilemmas faced by humanitarian aid to the present day.

JOHANNES PAULMANN (Leibniz Institute of European History,  
Mainz)

*The Cold War: History, Memory, and Representation.* International conference held at the European Academy Berlin, 14–17 July 2011 and co-sponsored by the Berlin city government; the European Academy Berlin; the German Historical Institutes in Moscow, London, and Washington; the Centre for Contemporary History in Potsdam; the Military History Research Institute in Potsdam; the Allied Museum in Berlin; the German–Russian Museum Berlin-Karlshorst; the Berlin Wall Foundation; the Airlift Gratitude Foundation (Stiftung Luftbrückendank) in Berlin; the Cold War International History Project in Washington; and the John F. Kennedy Institute for North American Studies of the Freie Universität Berlin. Conveners: Konrad Jarausch (University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill), Andrea Despot (European Academy Berlin), Christian Ostermann (Cold War International History Project, Washington), and Andreas Etges (Kennedy Institute, Freie Universität Berlin).

‘The past is never dead’, William Faulkner famously wrote in 1951 in *Requiem for a Nun*. ‘It’s not even past.’ This is definitely also true of the Cold War. Its traces are still visible in many places all around the world. It is the subject of exhibitions and new museums, of memorial days and historic sites, of documentaries and movies, of arts and culture. There are historical and political controversies, both national and international, about how the history of the Cold War should be told and taught, how it should be represented and remembered. While much has been written about the political history of the Cold War, the analysis of its remembrance and representation is just beginning. Bringing together a wide range of international scholars, the conference held at the European Academy Berlin focused on the public history of the Cold War from an international perspective, covering topics such as master narratives of the Cold War, places of memory, public and private memorialization, popular culture, and school-books. One impetus for the conference was the proposal to establish a new Museum of the Cold War at Checkpoint Charlie.

The first session, entitled ‘The Cold War: Master Narratives in East and West’, was opened by Odd Arne Westad (London), who emphasized the internationalization of Cold War historiography which has long been dominated by a Western and especially American perspective. The full conference programme can be found on the GHIL’s website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

can perspective. He described how international scholars have begun to shape the field and are helping to incorporate the global impact of the Cold War into scholarship. Referring to Berlin as a place of remembering the Cold War, Westad stressed the need to understand it as a lived experience and an underlying event which European nations experienced. It was therefore crucial, he suggested, for the development of the world we live in today.

Anders Stephanson (New York) critically discussed how the term 'Cold War' has been used in both public and academic discourse. In his view, it should be regarded as a US concept and project with a primarily American historiography. In terms of periodization, Stephanson argued that after 1963 the term 'Cold Peace' is more suitable for describing relations between the two superpowers. For Stephanson, Berlin was an anomaly during the Cold War. Next, David Reynolds (Cambridge) presented his comparison of Cold War narratives in Britain, France, and the Federal Republic of Germany. None of these entirely accepted the superpower polarity as the necessary master narrative, instead emphasizing national, European, or colonial aspects of Cold War history. During the Cold War, Britain and France were struggling with their loss of imperial power, while West Germany focused on the issues of German unity and German guilt. Vladimir Pechatnov (Moscow) discussed three narratives of the Cold War in the post-Soviet period. The standard Soviet version describes the Cold War as having been imposed on the Soviet Union by the United States. In this narrative the Soviets saw themselves as the victims of Western policies. A revisionist narrative which includes a massive rejection of the Soviet past emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s. A third, more recent, post-revisionist narrative is less ideological and stresses *realpolitik*, such as Russia's security interests.

In his keynote lecture, Jay Winter (Yale) discussed the Cold War between history and memory. He described memory as the intersection between family and world history, stressing that remembrance is an act of people, not of states. States can only provide an active symbolic exchange – at best, they manage to glorify those who died without honouring war itself. Winter described a booming memory industry that is driven not by the state but by society. He stated that the commemoration of war has changed over time. There is a popular disenchantment with war especially in Berlin, which is characterized by a lively but overwhelming memory landscape.

## Conference Reports

Winter's keynote lecture was followed by a panel on official versus biographical memorialization. Marie-Pierre Rey (Paris) compared the attitudes of the French and Russian states towards the Cold War. She outlined the Cold War's intense impact on social life, since everybody had to act within a binary scheme. This also manifested itself in popular culture, in novels, music, and art. For Russia, the Cold War and its end constitute a painful memory and a collective trauma, while in France loyalty to the West and the French role (for example, in détente policy) are emphasized. Sergej Kudryashov (Moscow) underlined that the experiences of the Cold War are an ongoing and serious issue in Russia. He drew attention to a uniquely Russian aspect, namely, the flourishing of amateur historiography. The work of non-professionals partially fills a gap in the country's collective memory of the Cold War. These amateurs to a large extent fulfil a popular demand for conspiracy and espionage histories. Serious historians find it difficult to react to these populist approaches. Matthias Uhl (Moscow) focused on spies as heroes of the Cold War. He presented parts of his research on double agent Oleg Penkovsky. Uhl stressed the importance of technology and espionage as the subject of a future Cold War exhibition in Berlin.

Contrasting the ways in which the superpowers remember the Cold War, Thomas Lindenberger (Vienna) concentrated on border communities in Eastern Europe. He presented his oral history microstudies of everyday life, politics, and the heterogeneity of remembering the Cold War in East and West. Nation-building and communist policies played a much larger part than Cold War issues in the border communities he examined. For Lindenberger, this justified and implied a critical perspective in mapping European memory of the Cold War, which has been seen as a Western term. The conference's first day ended with the screening of the PBS documentary *After the Wall: A World United* (2011). Former Ambassador James D. Bindenagel, who was involved in the production, took questions from the audience.

The session on popular culture and schoolbooks was opened by Tony Shaw (Hertfordshire) who gave a presentation on Cold War films in East and West. He argued that for ordinary people films gave real meaning to the Cold War and pointed out that they still have an impact on its memorialization, even among those born after the end of the conflict. Shaw identified five categories of Cold War films:

films that justify the Cold War; films of extremely positive or negative propaganda, depicting the home country as heaven and the other as hell; films about the nuclear threat; films on espionage; and films that give alternative images and provide a critique of the Cold War.

Next, Christopher Moran (Warwick) focused on Ian Fleming's James Bond novels. He stated that they filled a public vacuum at a time when the secret services had an even greater passion for secrecy than today. The Bond novels were in a privileged position, since there were hardly any competing spy novels at the time. Moran also analysed the direct correspondence between Fleming and the CIA and how it affected his stories. Falk Pingel (Brunswick) compared the depiction of the Cold War in social studies textbooks in the old Federal Republic of Germany, France, and Britain. Until the 1970s, he said, the term 'Cold War' was not used. Instead, 'East-West Conflict' was the preferred term, loaded with a great deal of meaning. National emphases differed. While French textbooks regarded the conferences at Yalta and Potsdam as crucial, German textbooks focused on Soviet policy.

The final session discussed sites of Cold War memory. Wayne Cocroft, senior archaeological investigator at English Heritage, talked about protecting, preserving, and presenting Cold War heritage. He discussed examples from more than thirty Cold War sites which have become nationally protected historic places in the United Kingdom. Csaba Békés (Budapest) depicted the memory landscape in East Central Europe, with a special focus on Hungary. Like others before him, he emphasized that 'Cold War' is not a term generally used in that region, where the communist experience and the memory of the communist past are crucial. The anthropologist Heonik Kwon (London) then looked at violent manifestations of the Cold War in the postcolonial world with its many millions of victims and contrasted it with the exceptionally long peace in post-war Europe, where the Cold War was more of an 'imaginary war'. He also emphasized the importance of family memory, and not just in East Asia.

Concentrating on Berlin as a place of history, memory, and representation of the Cold War, Hope Harrison (Washington) and Sybille Frank (Darmstadt) both outlined the Berlin state government's memorial plan. While Harrison focused on the recurring complications Germany faces as a result of the continuing process of unifica-

## Conference Reports

tion, Frank looked at the state of memorialization at Checkpoint Charlie. Both speakers pointed out that multiple and sometimes competing actors are part of Berlin's public history landscape. Harrison stressed the need to concentrate not only on the Wall and the division of Germany but also to provide a broader and multi-perspectival Cold War context. Frank compared Checkpoint Charlie with the Plymouth Plantation Heritage Center and detected a special German anxiety about the 'Disneyfication' of memorial sites when private institutions step in to fill a vacuum left by the state.

Finally, Konrad Jarausch (North Carolina) discussed the project for a Cold War museum at Checkpoint Charlie. Referring to some of the findings of the conference, he described the project as a major opportunity for the city of Berlin. The global nature of the conflict, including postcolonial struggles, and especially the dramatic role of individuals, he suggested, should be highlighted in a future exhibition. Jarausch described the aim of the Berlin conference as 'to create an intellectual frame of reference and to initiate a public debate about open questions regarding the project'. In this respect, it proved highly successful.

The conference ended with a reading by the Hungarian author György Dalos, a leading Eastern European intellectual, who presented his recently published biography of Mikhail Gorbachev, *Gorbatschow, Macht und Mensch: Eine Biografie* (2011).

JULA DANYLOW, JASMIN HEERMANN,  
CLAUDIA SCHUMACHER, ANDREAS ETGES

*Staging Empire: New Perspectives on the 1911 Coronation Durbar and Imperial Assemblage.* International Conference of the Department of History, Manchester Metropolitan University and the German Historical Institute London, held at Manchester Metropolitan University, 15–16 Sept. 2011. Conveners: Tilman Frasch (Manchester Metropolitan University) and Andreas Gestrich (German Historical Institute London).

In December 1911, King George became the only English ruler to be crowned Emperor of India in India itself. Following the style of previous Imperial Assemblages (1877, 1903), a vast area was laid out on the outskirts of Delhi where the event was staged. More than the previous assemblages or durbars, the Imperial Assemblage of 1911 was a medialized event. Newspapers around the world had sent their reporters to Delhi, and officially appointed photographers from the royal entourage produced images, as did the teams of at least eight film companies which recorded proceedings and began screening their films in Indian cinemas almost immediately after the event.

If older research on the 1911 Coronation Durbar focused on its significance for the history of India and the structure of the empire, more recent studies have addressed individual aspects such as film coverage or music, with the main focus on forms and media of interaction within the Empire and among imperial subjects around the world, while the impact of the durbar on India itself has been neglected. The conference therefore integrated various strands of research in analysing the durbar as one of the Empire's most medialized events.

After welcome addresses by Martin Hewitt, Head of MMU's History Department, and Andreas Gestrich, Director of the GHIL, John MacKenzie (Lancaster) delivered the first of two keynote lectures. In his lively and spirited presentation, MacKenzie emphasized the continuing importance of the Empire as a focus of historical research, and dealt with different perceptions of the durbar as an imperial event. Drawing on a broad range of examples and sources, he stressed the various forms of public engagement with the durbar (and, by implication, with India and the Empire). The durbar, he concluded,

The full conference programme can be found on the GHIL's website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

## Conference Reports

was an outstanding example to show how deeply embedded the Empire was in public perceptions.

The first panel of the day, chaired by Martin Hewitt (Manchester Metropolitan University), had ritual as a common theme. Alan Trevithick (Fordham University) dealt with ritual and its theoretical analysis, raising the question of discourse and perspective in ritual. Charles V. Reed (Elizabeth City State University) placed the durbar against the backdrop of royal tours to India and across the Empire and highlighted their part in the making of a British imperial culture.

Andreas Gestrich (GHIL) chaired the second panel, which examined images of the durbar. Annamaria Motrescu (Cambridge University) used amateur photographs and films to raise crucial theoretical questions such as the relationship between reality and the picture taken by the camera. In her analysis of images, she reflected on the effect of perspective and the creation of an imaginary cartography which became part of the official nostalgia. Unfortunately, Stephen Bottomore's (Bangkok) presentation on imperialism and the early cinema had to be cancelled.

The third panel, chaired by Margret Frenz (Leicester University), investigated symbols of the durbar. Stephen Patterson (Royal Collection) presented some of the symbols of royalty connected with the durbar, such as clothes, gems, and jewellery from the Royal Collection. He also drew attention to the afterlife of the objects, as some went on permanent display while others were re-worked for use on later occasions. The closing contribution of the first day, by Joachim K. Bautze (Berlin), explored the forms and functions of durbars in Indian history and culture. Presenting a wide range of visual sources, Bautze discussed instances in which the Imperial Durbar of 1911 not only deviated from its Indian protocol, but was less successful than its 1903 precursor. Bautze concluded that from an Indian point of view, the durbar as a political ceremony failed to impress the Indian audience.

Bernard Porter (Newcastle) gave the keynote lecture of the second day, chaired by Burjor Avari (Manchester Metropolitan University). Porter agreed with MacKenzie on the continuing importance of the Empire and the need to research it empirically, but also pointed to the danger of emphasizing the imperial imagination, largely because of the amount of evidence in this domain. Research is equally challenged by the problem of defining the term 'empire' itself, he sug-



gested, as the scope and contexts of sources need to be carefully examined. Referring to cases such as autobiographies by working-class authors in which the Empire or even migration are hardly ever mentioned, Porter ultimately defended his view that the 'Empire out there' could be run without anyone knowing it.

The fourth panel, chaired by Joachim K. Bautze (Berlin), focused on two often underestimated aspects of the durbar. Seán Lang (Anglia Ruskin University) offered interesting insights into Queen Mary's view of the durbar and her travels in India based on her scrapbooks. She can be considered the most overlooked figure of the durbar, and her scrapbooks not only provide a glimpse behind the scenes, but also indicate how the roles were divided between herself and the king. Nalini Ghuman's (Mills College) presentation added another dimension to the medialization of the durbar, in this case by way of Elgar's operatic *Crown of India*. In her multi-layered analysis of the 'March of the Maharajas', Ghuman exposed Elgar's sources and the 'Orientalist' notions that informed the composition, and ultimately discussed the place of the piece in Elgar's oeuvre.

Anindita Ghosh (Manchester University) chaired the fifth panel, which dealt with the repercussions and sedimentations of the durbar in different media and on the ground. Chandrika Kaul (University of St Andrews) argued that the durbar as a media event must be seen against the backdrop of political developments in Europe, and that it mainly aimed to address a British and European public. The durbar, moreover, was a message to British India that the Raj was still intact. Tilman Frasch (Manchester Metropolitan University) examined various media through which people could participate in or consume the durbar globally. One example he cited was postcards written by spectators and used to send private messages and greetings, a form of social networking that bears resemblance to the use of Twitter today. Minoti Chakravarty-Kaul (Lady Shri Ram College, University of Delhi) then looked at the physical space of the durbar, which cannot be separated from the construction of New Delhi and had a huge impact on the livelihood of Delhi's village communities. She pointed out that the requisition of land that began with the durbar and continues to the present day has almost destroyed the traditional way of life and that it has also impacted on other communities, for instance, in the Punjab.

In his concluding remarks, Christoph Cornelißen (Düsseldorf University) put the durbar in a comparative perspective, linking it as a

## Conference Reports

public celebration with other forms of a politics of performance in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Like the celebrations of the Emperor's birthday in Germany, these events were part of a social imperialism designed to reshape various forms of public space, making them a crucial part of national integration and confidence-building. Externally, these political performances at the same time served as significant tools in the power contest between states in those days. In order to understand the importance of these events it is important to use as many sources as possible, as the conference attempted to do. But the problem of measuring their resonance still remains. He suggested that a transnational perspective would provide new insights, for instance, by showing how German newspapers reported the durbar.

JUSTIN SIEFERT (Manchester Metropolitan University)

*The Fischer Controversy Fifty Years On.* International conference supported by the German Historical Institute London, the *Journal of Contemporary History*, the Open University, the Alfred Toepfer Stiftung, and the German History Society and held at the GHIL, 13–15 Oct. 2011. Conveners: Annika Mombauer (Open University), John Röhl (Sussex), and Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann (Oxford).

In October 2011, an international conference was held at the GHIL to mark the publication, fifty years ago, of a book which would spark one of the most heated historiographical debates of the twentieth century. In his 900-page study *Griff nach der Weltmacht* (the later English translation less provocatively entitled *Germany's Aims in the First World War*), the German historian Fritz Fischer argued that Germany had expansionist war aims in 1914, had pursued these war aims continuously throughout the war, and that Germany bore a considerable (*erheblich*) amount of responsibility for the outbreak of the First World War. These audacious assertions turned on their head a comfortable consensus in Germany which had existed since the late 1920s, rejecting the war-guilt allegations made by the victorious allies at Versailles in 1919. After the Second World War, for whose outbreak German responsibility was not in question, revisiting the causes of the First World War seemed unnecessarily soul-searching, and, moreover, politically unwise in the 1960s. As a consequence, the reactions to Fischer's theses by national conservative historians and in official circles were hostile. Among the insights revealed at the conference was a postcard which Gerd Krumeich had found in the papers of the late Wilhelm Deist, written by Fischer's most dogged opponent, Gerhard Ritter, in 1966: 'That man [i.e. Fischer] no longer exists for me as a colleague', Ritter wrote bitterly. This summed up perfectly what many conservative German historians felt in the 1960s. Fischer's raising of the 'guilt-question' at a time when this uncomfortable topic had been all but forgotten was unforgivable, at least for a generation of historians who, like Ritter, Zechlin, and Hans Herzfeld, had fought in the Great War with the conviction that they were engaged in a defensive war.

Events and anniversaries contemporaneous with the Fischer controversy help to explain the outrage with which Fischer's theses were received. The full conference programme can be found on the GHIL's website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

## Conference Reports

received in the Federal Republic. 1961 was, of course, the year the Berlin Wall was built, and saw the Eichmann trial in Israel, soon to be followed by the Auschwitz trials. The Fischer debate reached its peak in 1964, the year of the fiftieth anniversary of the war's outbreak, coincidentally the twenty-fifth anniversary of the outbreak of the even more destructive Second World War which, at least according to Fischer, Germany had instigated with similar aims to the First. At a time when Germany felt insecure and on the front line of opposing Cold War alliances, it is indeed easy to see why Fischer was *persona non grata* in many official circles.

Fifty years on, historians from Europe and North America gathered in London to take stock of this debate, and of the once so controversial views advanced by Fischer and his supporters. Had they stood the test of time? Is there any consensus after nearly 100 years of controversy, and five decades of the Fischer debate, as to why war broke out in 1914? The programme focused on a number of different aspects of Fischer's theses and of the historiographical debate, including the political significance of the controversy in the 1960s, the war aims of Germany and of the Entente, the Anglo-German naval race, and international decision-making on the eve of the war. The fiftieth anniversary of the publication of Fischer's path-breaking book also served as an occasion to invite a number of *Zeitzeugen* (among them Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann and Helmut Bley, though regrettably due to illness not Imanuel Geiss) who had either witnessed the development of the controversy first-hand or had worked with Fischer in the early 1960s and were able to illuminate some of Fischer's working methods.

The conference participants were spellbound when the account of one of Fischer's former *Doktoranden* Imanuel Geiss was read out in which he remembered working with Fischer on the book. A number of chapters of the controversial book were written collaboratively – with Geiss and another doctoral student, surrounded in Fischer's home by copies of documents from the archives, typing the first draft on an aged Remington typewriter. The crucial first chapter of *Griff nach der Weltmacht* (which gave rise to almost all of the controversy that followed its publication) was dictated by Geiss, with the three volumes by Luigi Albertini on his lap. Such reliance on the collaboration of assistants was, of course, not unusual within the German academic system at the time, as was confirmed by Egmont Zechlin's

former *Assistent*, Helmut Bley. Nonetheless, it may help to explain some of the stylistic oddities of *Griff nach der Weltmacht*.

Fischer's own Nazi past has recently been the focus of historical investigation, and the conference heard about Fischer's membership of the Nazi Party. It would seem that the experience of being a prisoner of war immediately after the Second World War (and there mixing with former Nazis who were still not willing to renounce their National Socialist views in spite of the obvious destruction that ideology had brought), as well as, more crucially, his experience of the USA and Britain in later years, turned him into a convinced liberal who consistently voted for the Social Democrats after 1945. Fischer had already distanced himself from the political aims of national-conservative historiography long before the 1960s—in fact, as early as the 1930s, when his theological background and his emphasis on a more conceptual history led him to reject the 'mandarin tradition'. In the 1960s, this helped him to distance himself openly from the prevailing tendencies of the predominant national-conservative historiographical tradition in West Germany, leading him, at least in the eyes of his critics, to a transformation from theological scholar to apparent 'Nestbeschmutzer'.

The difficult reception of Fischer's thesis in West Germany in the early 1960s was the topic of Hartmut Pogge von Strandmann's contribution. He was able to show that attempts to sideline Fischer were ultimately foiled by media interests and, in particular, by the support of two weekly papers, *Der Spiegel* and *Die Zeit*. The impact of Fischer's theses outside West Germany was a particular focus of the conference, with examples being drawn from East Germany (Matthew Stibbe), Russia (Joshua Sanborn), Austria (Günther Kronenbitter), and France (John Keiger). In East Germany, the developing debate was watched with much interest, as Matthew Stibbe showed. With varying degrees of scepticism and enthusiasm, GDR historians sought both to maintain links with, and to distance themselves ideologically from, the 'Fischer school' in Hamburg. Stibbe argued that Fischer had a significant impact on the methodological approach and style of argument adopted by leading East German historians of the First World War, such as Fritz Klein and Willibald Gutsche. Stibbe also asked to what extent Fischer was influenced by his contacts with GDR historians, and by the findings of East German research, but suggested that there is less evidence for such an ex-

## Conference Reports

change having taken place, and that an asymmetrical process of 'intertwining and differentiation' existed between East and West German historians.

In other European countries, it was much easier to accept Fischer's views than in West Germany, not least because in many ways he reiterated what Germany's former enemies already felt they knew – that Germany had deliberately caused the First World War. Russia and France had little to lose by agreeing with Fischer's interpretation. In fact, as John Keiger argued, France had rather a lot to gain from this new interpretation, not least because so much revisionist attention in the inter-war years had been focused on trying to prove that France had been to blame for the outbreak of war to a greater or lesser extent. This, and the recent experience of the Second World War, had led in France to a historical sensitivity which was unrivalled by the other former Great Powers. As a result, the impact of the Fischer controversy was acutely observed in France, where the consequences of Fischer's allegations might also have had the most important potential impact on current political concerns given that, at the time, the governments of the Fifth Republic and of West Germany were attempting to establish closer formal relations. This culminated in the Franco-German Friendship Treaty of 22 January 1963, and Fischer's controversial theses and the ensuing public debate (the prominent French historian, Jacques Droz, called it 'a German Dreyfus Affair'), published just around this critical juncture, had the potential to undermine this new *détente*. In contrast, in the Soviet Union, and in post-Soviet historiography of the war and its origins, Fischer's theses were not much discussed, and not particularly controversial. As Joshua Sanborn demonstrated, the crux of Fischer's arguments did not go against the Soviet historiographical grain. Moreover, of course, there was no controversy over Fischer's theses in the 1960s because there was no open historiographical debate in the Soviet historical profession.

In Austria after 1945, Christian-conservative historians in particular favoured a nostalgic view of the Habsburg Monarchy. As a consequence, as Günther Kronenbitter argued, they avoided the question of Austria-Hungary's responsibility for the outbreak of war in 1914, and tended to ignore Fischer's theses. The Fischer controversy did not lead to any major soul-searching among Austria's historians. Only one prominent historian, Fritz Fellner, attempted to widen the

debate by directing attention towards Vienna's decision-making during the July Crisis. Of course, in recent years historians have focused extensively on Austria-Hungary's role in and before 1914, and the work of Fellner, Sam Williamson, John Leslie, and Kronenbitter in particular has shown that Fischer would have done well to focus more of his attention on Germany's chief alliance partner.

Fischer's research on war aims was highlighted in a comparative framework. Holger Afflerbach explored the question of Fischer's analysis of the war aims of the Central Powers, while David Schimmelpenninck van der Oye analysed the war aims of Tsarist Russia. The foundations of Britain's war aims were considered by Keith Neilson, and Jennifer Jenkins provided an in-depth look at Germany's attempts to instigate nationalist (rather than jihadist) revolution in the Middle East. A close reading of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk by John W. Steinberg revealed that it was not a dress-rehearsal for Versailles, but rather harked back to the ideas of Bethmann Hollweg's infamous September Programme.

A large number of papers addressed the decision-making process in the years 1912 to 1914, and here the conference made some important contributions to current historiographical interpretations. Although in conclusion a consensus emerged that Fischer had got it right in attributing 'a significant part of the historical responsibility for the outbreak of a general war' to Germany, the question of why this was so has yet to be answered. Armed with overwhelming amounts of primary source evidence, which, as Annika Mombauer argued, had been of central importance in explaining the origins of the war ever since it started, we know much about the 'how', but still too little about the 'why'.

Furthermore, the focus must now also be on the actions of the other Great Powers. In July 1914, France was driven by the existential wish to remain a Great Power and by its fear of eventually being abandoned by an increasingly strong Russia, as Stefan Schmidt was able to show, while Bruce Menning demonstrated that Russia's resolve was strengthened by encouraging noises from the French leadership, which only served to firm up its intransigence. Christopher Clark argued that Serbia was in part motivated by the support it had been promised by Russia, and had a definite agenda which aimed at undermining the Austro-Hungarian Empire. All the while, Britain was caught in an impossible bind whereby not sup-

## Conference Reports

porting the Entente would potentially threaten its Empire, and, indeed, its security at home in the long run. These motivations need to be considered when we focus in detail on the crisis management of July 1914, when all these constraints dictated to a greater or lesser extent how Paris, London, St Petersburg, and Belgrade reacted to the threats emanating from Vienna and Berlin.

It also emerged that the origins of the decision for war need to be sought much earlier than July 1914, with the mobilization crisis of winter 1912–13 identified as a crucial juncture when a general European war very nearly broke out. War was only avoided when Germany and Austria-Hungary stepped back from the brink at the last moment, largely out of fear of British involvement. This dress-rehearsal for war of November and December 1912 left its mark on the planning of all the major powers, notably Russia and France, helping to explain why, during the crisis of 1914, war was less likely to be avoided a second time. The importance of the crisis provoked by the Balkan Wars was stressed by John Röhl, Christopher Clark, and Bruce Menning, and seems to point towards a new focus of enquiry which is set to shed revealing new light on the war planning of the major powers in the two years before the outbreak of war. This focus also serves as a potential counter-argument to the recently advanced views that in the long tradition of ‘avoided wars’, the crisis of July 1914 need not have escalated. Some of the tentative conclusions reached in London seem to suggest that the key decision-makers in all European capitals, but particularly in Vienna, Berlin, Belgrade, and St Petersburg, were determined that there would not be another narrowly avoided war after the crisis of 1912–13. A logical outcome of that attitude would be that the next international crisis would unavoidably lead to the outbreak of war among the major powers.

Hew Strachan summed up the historiographical and historical significance of Fritz Fischer’s work, and of the debate on the origins of war and on war aims. He explained how, following *Griff nach der Weltmacht*, a new understanding of the First World War as part of a worldwide revolutionary situation developed. He argued that Fischer’s book demonstrated that war was not, in fact, a continuation of politics by other means, but that the First World War changed everything. The evidence which Fischer amassed showed that Germany was intent on a complete overthrow of the status quo, on



creating a New Order. The question which Fischer's work raised was why Germany did not decide to continue prospering as it had done, but instead chose war.

Of course, Fischer's work highlighted many uncomfortable continuities between the First and Second World Wars, and these were the topic of Gerhard Hirschfeld's contribution. It is clear that much of Hitler's war was directly influenced by the First World War. The war of 1939 continued the *Entgrenzung* of warfare which began in 1914, including such transgressions as gas warfare, blockade and mass starvation, the bombing of cities, the terrible treatment of prisoners of war, the absence of distinction between combatants and non-combatants, and the role of mass propaganda. Hirschfeld also emphasized the important role of memory, which provided further fateful links between the two wars. For example, the memory of the hunger winter of 1917-18 stood in direct relation to ten million slave labourers being brought into Germany during the Second World War to prevent starvation, while the memory of the attack of the Cossacks on Germany in 1914 led to fear of the Russians in 1944-5. In conclusion it became evident that the way we study the First, and, indeed, the Second World War, has changed profoundly since Fischer first undertook his research. Even our recent interest in the cultural history of the war would not have been possible, Hirschfeld contended, without Fritz Fischer's pioneering research and his resolute stand.

In summing up the conference's findings, Jonathan Steinberg felt compelled to revise the way he would teach the origins of the war in future. He suggested that a new model of explanation of the war's causes needed to include the five key powers (plus Serbia, one might add), whose decisions were concurrently influenced by deep pessimism and general fear as well as unfounded exuberance and optimism in equal measure. And yet, despite much new food for thought, fifty years after Fischer first published *Griff nach der Weltmacht*, Steinberg still concluded that the premise of Fischer's controversial thesis remained unchallenged: that Germany did indeed bear a considerable share of the blame in the events that led to the outbreak of the First World War.

ANNIKA MOMBAUER (The Open University)

*Medieval History Seminar.* Conference organized by the German Historical Institute Washington and the German Historical Institute London, with help from Jan-Hendryk de Boer (University of Göttingen), and held at the GHIW, 13–16 Oct. 2011.

The seventh meeting of the Medieval History Seminar, again jointly organized by the German Historical Institute Washington and the German Historical Institute London, took place in Washington, DC on 13–16 October 2011. Invited as participants were sixteen young medievalists—six from Germany, four from the United Kingdom, four from the United States, one from Switzerland, and one from Denmark—who were joined by conveners Stuart Airlie, Michael Borgolte, Patrick J. Geary, Frank Rexroth, Barbara H. Rosenwein, and Miri Rubin, and the organizers Miriam Rürup, Jochen Schenk, and Jan-Hendryk de Boer, to discuss current research in the broadly defined field of Medieval History. In her opening lecture, Barbara Rosenwein (Chicago) outlined the emerging field of a history of emotions of the Middle Ages, illustrating why emotions are historically variable. During the Middle Ages different emotional communities evolved, ranging from communities that left hardly any room for the rhetoric of emotions to those that were constituted by a highly emotional and affective way of acting and speaking.

Over the following three days, participants' papers were discussed in eight panels. All papers had been distributed in advance of the seminar. Each panel therefore began with an introduction of both papers by two fellow participants acting as commentators, followed by a short initial reply by the authors and general questions and answers. As in previous years, this procedure ensured intense and thorough-going discussions. The opening panel started with a presentation of Ingo Trüter's (Göttingen) paper on the social and cultural capital that men of learning living around 1500 could acquire with a doctoral degree. As a striking example he introduced a jurist from Tübingen whose degree served as a prerequisite for social rise. Seen from this perspective, earning a doctoral degree was a costly investment that could pay off in the future. Christopher Kurpiewski's (Princeton) dissertation analyses the relationship between the German mystic Christina von Stommeln (1242–1312) and her Dominican

The full conference programme can be found on the GHIL's website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

confessor representing the Dominicans' acceptance of the *cura monalium*. Kurpiewski's attentive examination of the confessor's letters and treatises revealed these texts as stylized documents of a spiritual friendship and as an apology for *cura*, which he portrayed as integral to the Dominican mission.

The second panel was opened by Ulla Reiss's (Frankfurt) paper on the evolution of technical language in English account books during the twelfth century. As her paper demonstrated, scribes of the royal English exchequer tentatively employed different notations and signs, which over time developed into something like 'expertise'. By adopting useful solutions and dismissing other efforts these scribes unintentionally participated in creating a specialized language of accounting. While it is often argued that organizations provide the frame for technical language to develop, Reiss suggested that in the case of the English exchequer an organization emerged from the successive development of a technical language in the Pipe Rolls. Miriam Weiss (Trier) presented the results of a close reading of the *Chronica maiora* by Matthew Paris, showing how a comparison of the different redactions of the text helps to cast light on Matthew Paris's multifaceted strategy of 'intentional oblivion' as a means of adapting his *Chronica* to changing audiences and circumstances.

In the third panel, Angela Ling Huang (Copenhagen) presented her econo-historical study of the international dimension of cloth production in Hanseatic towns in the fifteenth century. Using material from London custom accounts, she demonstrated how local government enforced high standards of quality on imported goods, thus becoming important players in Hanseatic cloth production and trade. Benjamin Pope (Durham) followed the suggestions of German *Landesgeschichte* to re-examine relationships between townspeople and the rural nobility in late medieval Erfurt and Nuremberg, arguing that the lack of an overall narrative and the varieties on the phenomenal level should be interpreted as the result of the sources' social function as documents of the interaction between urban and rural elites: one group used the other as a means of determining its own identity.

The fourth panel was opened by Johanna Dale's (Norwich) comparative study of saints' feasts and royal coronation dates in England, France, and Germany in the High Middle Ages. A detailed comparison of the coronation dates showed that they were well cho-

## Conference Reports

sen to mark the significance of the event and to place it in a liturgical frame. This strategy served to load political events with biblical and historical symbolism. This was followed by a lively discussion of Tillman Lohse's (Berlin) completed doctoral dissertation on the continuity of the foundation of a collegiate church in Goslar. In it, the author revealed that the continuity of the foundation from the Middle Ages to the present was the result of retrospective abstracting from the many continuities of the foundation at different social, liturgical, and economic levels.

In the fifth panel, Michèle Steiner (Fribourg) took an intercultural perspective on the life of Muslim subjects in the Norman kingdom of Sicily. Studying everyday interaction between Muslims and Christians, Steiner pointed out that the Normans were willing to adopt principles of Islamic law in their legal contracts with Muslims. This she regarded as further proof of the Normans' well-known strategy of stabilizing their power by assimilating local traditions. John Young (Flagler College) likewise considered everyday contacts between different religious groups: Jews and monks were frequent if unlikely economic partners in the High Middle Ages. Comparing a vast array of documents from the German empire, Young argued that Jews and monks interacted regularly in negotiations and discussions with each other. Shifting the focus from extraordinary interactions such as religious debates to the fairly unremarkable everyday ones, he presented contacts between the two communities as usually normal and peaceful.

In the sixth panel, Thomas Greene's (Chicago) paper on Haimo of Auxerre's emotional eschatology followed the path opened by Barbara Rosenwein in her opening lecture. In order to reconstruct the standards in the emotional community that was formed by the monks of Auxerre, Greene examined Haimo's emotional eschatology in his comments on the emotions experienced by souls after death. In Hildegard of Bingen, Christopher Fletcher (Chicago) chose another famous medieval religious author as the subject of his paper. Her letters became the hallmark of a subjective theology. Letters were Hildegard's foremost means of putting into practice her theological conviction to direct and save souls. Writing letters to abbots and abbesses played a crucial part in implementing her reform theology.

The unforeseen cancellation of Jason Berg's (Leeds) paper on monsters and monstrous language in the *Cosmography of Aethicus Ister*

left plenty of time to discuss Kristin Skottki's (Rostock) completed dissertation in the seventh panel. She studied Latin First Crusade chronicles as historical sources and literary products in an intercultural perspective. These chronicles should no longer be read as truthful mirrors of reality, she suggested, but instead as multi-layered representations of possible world views and as drafts of the role of the self and the other – begging for the readers' seal of approval.

On the last day of the conference, Maximilian Schuh (Munich) opened the eighth panel with an overview of the results of his recently finished dissertation on fifteenth-century Humanism at the University of Ingolstadt. Shifting the focus from the well-known great Humanists such as Konrad Celtis to the more mundane ways in which the new learning evolved in the Faculty of Arts, Schuh showed how the professors and their students felt their way in order to merge new methods and insights with older traditions. Finally, Eleanor Janega (London) highlighted the spatial dimensions of Jan Milic's sermons, arguing that the preacher's calls to reform responded to a changing urban culture in Prague during the reign of Charles IV.

The conveners used the final discussion to pass on some practical and theoretical advice on how to write a comprehensive and thorough dissertation. Nevertheless, it is not easy to harmonize idealistic and pragmatic claims. Whereas Michael Borgolte encouraged young medievalists to open their gaze to non-Latin cultures, Patrick J. Geary reflected on the different cultural importance of the Middle Ages to European and American scholars. While the identity of modern-day Europeans remains anchored in Europe's medieval heritage in one way or another, for Americans the Middle Ages are a foreign culture, comparable to that of ancient China or ancient India. There was general agreement among the participants that events like the Medieval History Seminar and institutions like the German Historical Institutes, which bring together young and senior medievalists from different countries and backgrounds, offer researchers important and much needed opportunities to compare their methods and approaches with colleagues from different academic communities – and thereby to acquire the competence to identify shortcomings in their own academic traditions.

JAN-HENDRYK DE BOER (University of Göttingen)

*Listening Spaces: Art Music and its Audiences in the Concert Hall and Beyond, c.1850–1945.* One-day workshop held at the German Historical Institute London, 21 Oct. 2011. Conveners: Neil Gregor (Southampton), James Mansell (Nottingham), and Andreas Gestrich (GHIL).

Since the early nineteenth century the concert hall has been acknowledged as a key site of sociability, education, discipline, and display, in European cities both large and small. Much recent research on what is conventionally taken to be the high era of the bourgeois consumption of art music has sought to differentiate the image of the 'attentive audience' contemplating the timeless art object in the auratic space of the concert hall. Instead, it seeks to recover a wider range of musical listening experiences located in a greater variety of spatial contexts, shaped not just by the physical environs of the immediate listening space but also by the peculiarities of civic or regional culture more generally. This informal one-day workshop at the GHIL brought together historians, musicologists, and cultural geographers to present and discuss the findings of recent work in this inter-disciplinary problem field.

The first session focused on regional and civic cultures as factors influencing cultures of musical listening. In his paper, 'Concerts and their Audiences in Bradford, West Yorkshire, c.1850–1939', Dave Russell (Leeds Metropolitan) focused on the extent to which events were organized on a 'free market' principle; the social uses of concerts and elements of social stratification they reflected and reinforced; and the extent to which they could be accessed by the working class. As he argued, concert publics were socially diverse and open but still reflected political, social, and cultural hierarchies. The Bradford Subscription Concerts, founded in 1865 and held in the 3,300 seat St George's Hall, became the city's most prestigious cultural event and an opportunity for the display of wealth and, via seat pricing, a practical demonstration of the hierarchies existing within the local middle class. Sections of the city's working class exhibited a strong musical culture rooted in brass bands, choral societies, amateur orchestral societies, and popular opera. Attempts were also made to provide opportunities for this group, invariably financially

The full conference programme can be found on the GHIL's website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

unable to attend the concert hall in any number. By the late 1920s and early 1930s, he argued, these particular forms of local sociability were in crisis with audiences falling and finances in disarray. Many saw this moment of rupture as strongly suggestive of fundamental shifts in taste as sections of the audience turned to the gramophone and especially the wireless for serious music, and/or came to place more obviously popular genres at the core of their musical lives.

As George Revill (Open University) showed in his paper, 'Cecil Sharp and Alan Lomax: Nationalism, Heterogeneity, and the Politics of Culture Areas', music was used to construct urban or regional identity not only from within, but also from without, as ethnomusicologists, collectors, and other writers explored cultural space through music too. In the one paper in the workshop which focused on something other than European art music, Revill examined the way in which folk collectors negotiated the inherent heterogeneity of folk music practices as they constructed ideas of the nation, exploring their contrasting approaches to folk music within the context of the broader cultural politics of folk collecting. Between 1916 and 1918 Cecil Sharp spent twelve months in the Southern Appalachian Mountains, collecting folk songs, convinced that he might find the 'lost' folk music of his own country, England, in the southern Appalachians. The American Alan Lomax also collected folk songs in the Appalachians on several occasions, most notably with his father in the 1930s and again during the period 1959 to 1965. As Revill outlined, there were evident contrasts between the folk collecting strategies of Sharp and Lomax as represented by their work in the Appalachians. Sharp went in search of cultural survivals in order to locate and define a historically isolated outlier of English culture, while Lomax, on the contrary, was well aware of the hybrid nature of Appalachian music. For him, however, this was not a threat to the integrity of American national identity but a primary building block for a democracy built on the idea of the melting pot.

The second session focused on concert hall listening in Germany and France. Hansjakob Ziemer (MPI for the History of Science, Berlin) gave a paper entitled 'Integration through Listening: Social Imagination, Concert Halls, and Music in Frankfurt am Main, 1860–1930', which placed concert listening in the context of a city with a particular set of liberal political traditions. The problem of access to concerts was particularly felt in Frankfurt where, in part through

## Conference Reports

rigid subscription policies, concerts seemed to be an almost exclusive possession of the wealthy middle class. Ziemer explored how Frankfurt attempted to use architectural space and musical experiences to solve social problems. Drawing on ethnographer Christopher Small's insight that concert halls are social constructions that dramatize and make visible how a society imagines itself, Ziemer used Frankfurt as a case study for Small's argument that concert halls have two functions: on the one hand, the spatial organization can reflect present social and political convictions in society; on the other, it can shape new kinds of social behaviour. The point is that architectural constructions can steer social relationships and suggest ways in which listeners relate to the sounds, to each other, and to society. This was demonstrated through exploration of three concert hall designs: the 1861 construction of the first concert hall in Frankfurt, the Saalbau; the Festhalle which opened in 1909; and the 1927 blueprint for a new concert hall.

In her paper, 'Musical Art and Music as Leisure: Nineteenth-Century French Audiences Talk Back', Katharine Ellis (Royal Holloway) challenged the influential thesis advanced by James Johnson in 1995 that audiences 'fell silent' in the early nineteenth century, arguing instead that even in the case of art music, many of the noisy phenomena of the eighteenth century resurfaced in a new guise. Drawing on many examples which reflected the wide variety of ways in which music was consumed in nineteenth-century Paris, Ellis argued that audiences were far often less still, and less attentive, than Johnson's argument implied. The tendency for audience members to leave concerts early, for instance, was ingrained, while telling visual material documents their habit of getting up and moving about in the middle of pieces. And even when they were sitting still, Ellis pointed out, it is not clear that they were concentrating. Read carefully, much evidence suggests that the body postures associated with attentive listening in fact embodied acts of simulation: audiences, as much as musicians, in other words, were part of the performance. Ellis also questioned the rigid distinctions between entertainment and seriousness that much work on the nineteenth century continues to foreground, and the directness with which that might map onto social distinctions between different classes of listeners. She noted, instead, a clear capacity on the part of listeners to move between the two, and pointed out a trend for new forms of concert-



as-entertainment to emerge over the period and for the informal behavioural patterns exhibited by listeners in one space to reproduce themselves in ostensibly more serious venues.

The final session consisted of two papers, each of which explored, in different ways, music-making in domestic space and the relationship of this to wider discourses on aesthetics and emotion in the period. In her paper, “‘New links between them’: Modernist Historiographies and the Concerts of Nadia Boulanger”, Jeanice Brooks (Southampton) took the example of Nadia Boulanger’s concerts to examine how concepts of tradition and innovation marked the reception of both early and new music in the inter-war years. Boulanger’s programming practice exemplified the dramatized relation to history that characterized French musical neo-classicism. She was influential in promoting this strand of thinking in the New World. A material counterpart to Boulanger’s approach can be seen in the Music Room at Dumbarton Oaks, where Boulanger conducted in the late 1930s. Here, the owners showed a disinclination to segregate their collecting similar to that visible in Boulanger’s eclectic programmes. The room incorporated pieces from a range of centuries and countries, and there was no systematic chronological or geographical order to the display. Nadia Boulanger seems to have been particularly sensitive to the potential resonance between this setting, the compositional concerns of the new piece she was directing, and her own experiments in concert planning. She continued to promote similar links in her work in the United States in the following years, often performing concerts and lecture-recitals in house museums and art galleries as well as on conventional concert stages, and continuing to evoke visual analogies to make her music-historical points.

In her paper, ‘Music in the Home: Some *Longue-durée* Reflections on Domesticity, Sexuality, and Bourgeois Identity’, Maiken Umbach (Nottingham) took the example of domestic music rooms in Wilhelmine Germany as a case study through which to challenge Norbert Elias’s influential argument that the ‘civilizing process’ of modernity was driven by a desire to control and discipline emotion, and, by extension, to pursue the government of the citizenry through implicitly coercive regimes of bodily (self-)discipline. Instead, her paper situated the interior design projects of architects such as Hermann Muthesius within the wider context of a bourgeois reform movement aimed at fostering a particular form of selfhood which sat uneasily

## Conference Reports

with inherited images of a supine, conformist, or reactionary middle class for whom learning to domesticate one's own emotions was part of a wider project by which the bourgeoisie was *itself* domesticated. Rather than simply regulate emotions, the designs of music rooms aimed to stimulate and stage the very affective states that needed to be channelled and controlled. A wide range of visual material, both historical and contemporary, testified to the ambiguities of the music room's role and its place in both fostering and containing a particular form of bourgeois sensibility. Accordingly, in the civilizing process, rationality and affect were not two mutually exclusive states or modes of being, but existed in a mutually constitutive relationship in which, crucially, power called forth the very transgressiveness it claimed to seek to control.

NEIL GREGOR (University of Southampton)

*Sport in Early Modern Culture.* Joint conference of the DFG Network 'Body Techniques in the Early Modern Period' and the German Historical Institute London, held at the GHIL, 17-19 Nov. 2011. Conveners: Rebekka von Mallinckrodt (Free University Berlin) and Angela Schattner (GHIL).

This conference, the last in a series of four organized by the DFG Network 'Body Techniques in the Early Modern Period', focused on the role of sport and physical exercise in early modern society, something that has so far largely been ignored in the historiography. The conference had two main concerns: first, it asked how sport was embedded in social, economic, and political contexts; and secondly, it asked about new methodologies and potential new approaches to sources that have so far been neglected. The papers presented at the conference discussed issues relating to space, medicine and health, social and political change, and commercialization and professionalization.

The first two papers looked at the spatial localization of sport and the development of an infrastructure of sport in connection with a leisure culture, commercialization, and social differentiation. Christian Jaser (Dresden) took an urban micro-history approach to the history of sport, providing a detailed analysis of the sporting habits of different social milieux, and contextualizing them in terms of contemporary social, economic, political, and urban developments. Taking the example of tennis courts in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Paris, he demonstrated that their spatial distribution in the city showed whether they were used by aristocrats, artisans, or students. The boom in building tennis courts in Paris between 1500 and 1600 can be explained, he said, by increasing demand within the framework of a growing urban leisure culture and the choice of tennis courts as an investment by wealthy people. The courts were separate commercial units, and the owners lent or sold users the necessary equipment.

Angela Schattner (London) investigated the social use of sports facilities, differentiating between the function of communal and exclusive spaces in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Britain. Communal spaces such as churchyards and commons offered places where

The full conference programme can be found on the GHIL's website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

## Conference Reports

whole urban and rural communities could meet and engage in social activities and sport. By providing space for sport within the community, they strengthened the community. From the fifteenth century, by contrast, aristocrats, and, following their example, the guilds, created sports facilities with limited access, or ones that had to be rented, thus creating their own social spaces underlining their exclusivity. These exclusive spaces which charged for entry or rent also gave wealthy social climbers a chance to imitate the way in which the elites spent their leisure time.

The second session looked at the social, cultural, and religious factors that influenced sport in the early modern period. Taking the example of the Cotswold Olimpick Games, Charlotte Zweynert (Berlin) explained how in seventeenth-century Britain sports events were tied in to the political and religious debate on sporting activities and the Sabbath initiated by the Puritans. In order to prevent a ban on his Olimpick Games, held annually near Gloucestershire at the beginning of the seventeenth century, Robert Dover made sure that the idea behind his Games accorded with Puritan views on sport and gambling. He forbade betting during the Games and held them on week days so that there was no risk of a prohibition by local Puritan authorities. He and his friends and patrons reserved public criticism of Puritan attitudes for the literary treatment of the Games in a volume of poetry, *Annalia Dubrensis*, published in 1636, in which the authors celebrated Dover as the saviour of 'Merry England'.

In his paper, Wolfgang Behringer (Saarbrücken) argued that the early modern period in Europe should be considered a separate sporting era when competitive sports were 'sportified', ball games became more popular, aristocratic physical education was combined with an aristocratic code of behaviour and cult of the body, and sport was institutionalized and rules codified. The example he used was that of European ball games. Played in all European ruling houses, they gradually replaced the tournaments which, until then, aristocrats had participated in widely. From the sixteenth century at the latest, he said, ball games formed a standard part of a young aristocrat's schooling and a humanistic education. The institutionalization of sport, he explained, could be traced in the increasing differentiation of ball games such as tennis, pallone, and calcio across Europe, in their representation in paintings, drawings, tracts, and rule books, and in the ever expanding infrastructure of sports facilities.

The third section focused on the relationship between health and physical exercise as discussed in advice manuals and letters, and its social and gender differentiation. Alessandro Arcangeli (Verona) investigated the gender-specific prescription of physical exercise specifically for aristocratic women in medical guides of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. He emphasized that the exercises recommended in this literature must be seen as part of the canon of healthy leisure activities recommended to compensate for the aristocracy's lack of work. In this genre of literature addressed to a male audience, women were seen in their role as mothers giving birth and nursing their babies, and the function of physical exercise was seen as to enhance health and beauty. For the 'weaker sex', light exercise, such as graceful and modest dancing, the female exercise par excellence, or even passive movement (*agitatio*), such as being carried in a litter, was recommended to maintain health.

Sandra Cavallo and Tessa Storey (London) drew a comparison between theoretical advice literature and the practice of exercise in seventeenth-century Italy, using the private letters of the Roman aristocratic Spada family. Concepts and practices for promoting health documented in both types of sources reveal a changed attitude towards the benefits and execution of sport since Antiquity. Changing ideas of social origins and physique, notions of gentility, and new aesthetic demands of the aristocratic body played an important part in differentiating the aristocracy socially from the lower classes. Thus excessively strenuous sports, it was believed, could only be carried out by working people, who had an appropriate physique. For aristocrats and scholars, by contrast, light activities such as walking or easy ball games were considered suitable to protect their 'tender complexions'. Categories such as age and sex were important factors in choosing physical exercise, and changed attitudes towards the body favoured a new model of aristocratic masculinity. A comparison of the sources shows a dynamic exchange between advice literature and the ideas of lay people on the one hand, and medical paradigms and aristocratic fashions on the other.

The fourth session dealt with the professionalization and commercialization of boxing, and the introduction of more scientific methods of training in Britain at the end of the eighteenth century. Benjamin Litherland (Sussex) outlined interconnections between the commercialization of sport, the beginnings of advertising in newspa-

## Conference Reports

pers, and the transformation of pugilism into a national spectacle with professional boxing stars. Referring to contemporary stars of boxing such as James Figg, George Taylor, Jack Broughton, and Daniel Mendoza, he explained how successful boxers knew how to market themselves through targeted advertising. Using their names in connection with self-conferred titles such as 'British Champion' and the promise of a bloody spectacle, they increased their name recognition and that of the places where they held their matches, which they mostly ran themselves. This attracted larger audiences, increasing the profits generated. Their star status and this degree of commercialization, Litherland said, was only made possible by a combination of higher wages in the eighteenth century, the rise of a consumer culture with an increased demand for entertainment, and the beginnings of the advertising industry.

Dave Day (Manchester), also speaking about boxing, showed how the commercialization and professionalization which took place in the eighteenth century went along with an increasingly scientific approach to the sport. Influenced by the Enlightenment idea that sporting abilities could be improved with knowledge of bodily processes, trainers attempted to enhance the achievements of their young boxers by means of good nourishment and targeted technical training. Victory now depended not only on strength, but also on treating one's own body professionally. The better trained the athletes, the bigger the audiences they attracted, and the more profit could be made from betting on them.

Contributions to the fifth session dealt with status and sport in a non-European context. Michael Wert (Milwaukee) outlined how sword fighting in early modern Japan as part of Samurai culture had developed into a competitive sport of the rich peasant classes by the end of the eighteenth century, and pointed to the change in status involved. During the Tokugawa period (1600-1868), an official prohibition on non-Samurais carrying weapons meant that fencing became an elite status symbol. At the same time, it was transformed from a practical fighting technique into a form of culture transmitted by fencing schools. The professionalization of fencing instruction began in the eighteenth century, when the social decline of the rural Samurai started and they had to earn money by teaching the sons of rich peasants. As a result, social boundaries began to blur. New techniques directed more towards winning competitions were developed

in these circles and competed with the more traditional techniques and teachings of aristocratic fencing. With the disappearance of the social system based on status groups, gains in cultural and social status also lost significance, and the number of fencers decreased.

Rebekka von Mallinckrodt (Berlin) looked at social demarcation through sport, taking the example of swimming. She investigated the link between the topos of the Noble Savage and the development of swimming as a sport in Europe. While the 'natural abilities' of indigenous peoples were considered impressive, she said, the differences between the 'culturally superior' Europeans and those they conquered also had to be clearly marked in swimming. In the eighteenth century, large numbers of learn-to-swim manuals which drew on theoretical and empirical research were published. This 'new invention' of swimming was an expression of the European worldview based on rationality, and ultimately contributed to social differentiation, not only in a transcultural perspective. Within each society, the correct technique was a matter of social status, so that in Europe, too, the swimming practices of the lower classes and seafarers could not provide a model.

The final session looked at sporting accidents, avoidance of risk, and the promotion of fairness in combat sports under the heading of 'Danger'. Steven Gunn (Oxford) presented sporting accidents as reflected in sixteenth-century autopsy reports, evaluated in the context of a large research project on the history of everyday life funded by the ESRC. Gunn presented these reports as a new type of source for the investigation of sport and physical exercise in the everyday life of early modern Britain. Although there are some analytical problems associated with this type of source—for example, it permits the investigation only of 'dangerous' sports—he suggested that in the descriptions of the circumstances in which accidents happened, these records could provide important information on how sport was practised. Quantitative evaluation, for example, allowed statements to be made about the participation of different social groups in sports such as archery, hammer-throwing, and football, and made it possible to draw conclusions concerning gender differentiation, preferred sports facilities, and favoured times.

The risk of accidents and attempts to avoid them in combat sports were also addressed in the closing paper, given by Ann Tlusty (Bucknell University), speaking on shooting clubs and sword fight-

## Conference Reports

ing schools in German towns of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Although the authorities supported shooting and sword fighting because of their military usefulness, she said, the clubs and schools were more concerned with sporting aspects and male sociability. Fairness and safety, she suggested, were more important than military training, and were guaranteed by the codification of rules, competition judges, and strict punishments for those who infringed the rules. For the towns, shooting events served as a demonstration of their citizens' military capabilities. As popular festivals, they also helped to shape the identity of urban communities, and could influence relations with other towns both positively and negatively.

Delivering the concluding commentary, Wolfgang Behringer emphasized the surprisingly high degree of commercialization found in early modern sport, something that had been mentioned several times during the conference, and spoke of the large number of non-institutionalized sports which need more investigation. He also pointed to the breadth of sources touched upon here which have hardly so far been used for the history of sport, such as wood cuts, drawings, letters, and serial sources such as autopsy reports, and encouraged scholars to combine different sources in their investigations. Methodologically, too, he suggested, it should be considered whether the variety of European regions favours a micro-historical or more comparative European approach.

In the concluding discussion, the question of whether defining central terms such as 'sport', 'physical education', and 'leisure time' would hinder or help the contextualization and expansion of the source basis attempted at the conference generated a lively debate. On the one hand, a relatively narrow definition of sport has long prevented scholars from looking at many forms of early modern physical games, competitions, and exercises. On the other hand, conceptual explication would make it easier to connect the concerns of historians of sport with investigations of early modern notions of gender, religious, social, political, medical, and scientific developments. This touched upon one of the main concerns of the conference, namely, to lead research on the history of sport out of its thematic isolation.

AMELIE RÖSINGER (University of Constance) and  
ANGELA SCHATTNER (GHIL)



*Screen Culture and the Social Question: Poverty on Screen 1880–1914.*

Conference of the German Historical Institute London in cooperation with Screen1900 Project, University of Trier, held at the GHIL, 1–3 Dec. 2011. Conveners: Andreas Gestrich (GHIL) and Ludwig Vogl-Bienek (University of Trier).

Public screenings with the magic lantern emerged as a widespread social practice in the nineteenth century. The ‘art of projection’ firmly established the screen as a part of international cultural life. The audience was already prepared for the rapid success of ‘cinematography’, which took off at the beginning of the twentieth century. An astonishingly large number of lantern slides and early films were used to present the living conditions of the poor and the controversial discourse on the Social Question in public performances around 1900. In line with the various aspects of the conference topic, the papers approached this issue from very different perspectives.

In their introductory address, conveners Andreas Gestrich and Ludwig Vogl-Bienek indicated the shared interest of their institutions in exploring representations of poverty. As examples Gestrich named Trier University’s Collaborative Research Centre ‘Strangers and Poor People’ (SFB600) and the GHIL’s current research project ‘Pauper Letters and Petitions for Poor Relief in Germany and Great Britain, 1770–1914’. Ludwig Vogl-Bienek spoke of the ‘hidden history’ of lantern and screen culture in the nineteenth century. Their historic function in the public sphere has hardly been explored by social historians, he said, and is seriously under researched in media history. Vogl-Bienek named the lack of availability of primary sources, especially the lantern slides themselves, as one of the main obstacles to research, and pointed to current efforts to publicize knowledge of the magic lantern by making digitized lantern slides available to researchers and the general public alike.

The first panel was entitled ‘Screen Culture and the Public Sphere: Historical Context and Social Impact 1880–1914’. In his paper ‘The Social Impact of Screen Culture 1880–1914’, Martin Loiperdinger (Trier) showed that lantern shows were used in diverse contexts such as public lectures, church services, German Navy League recruiting drives, and by religious and charitable organizations in Britain. He

The full conference programme can be found on the GHIL’s website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

## Conference Reports

suggested that descriptions of audience response should use the concept of appropriation instead of the stimulus-response model. Stephen Bottomore (Bangkok) focused on the role of the magic lantern and the cinematograph in political campaigns in his paper, 'The Lantern and Early Film for Political Uses'. As a basis for further research he presented a typology of the various applications of projection media in political campaigns. One of his major examples was the 1907 campaign by the Conservative Party in Britain. In his comment Andreas Gestrich discussed the relationship between screen culture and the public sphere. He highlighted the public reception of projection media as a shift away from privatization compared with the private consumption of print media. He assumed that social competition between different organizations was one of the bases of the mass distribution of media. In the discussion, the elements of performance in the art of projection were suggested as a basis for crucial research questions: audiences and their living environment, organizers (organizations), performers, venues, apparatus, slides and films, texts, and music.

The following panel, entitled 'Road Show: Approaches to the Hidden History of Screen Culture', shifted the focus towards the current situation of research in this field. Ine van Dooren (Brighton) and Frank Gray (Brighton) in their dual roles as researchers and archivists spoke about the obstacles lantern scholars face and efforts to establish the digital slide collection and information database LUCERNA. They also reported on the related Lucerna cooperation network established by the universities of Brighton, Indiana, and Trier, and the Magic Lantern Society. Frank Gray suggested that the lack of research structures and a common methodological framework were preventing the establishment of 'lantern studies'. He stressed the importance of a contextual approach to magic lantern history that takes into account various inter-textual and inter-medial relationships with other cultural practices and art forms. In her presentation 'Archiving and Preserving Lantern Slides and Related Resources', Ine van Dooren described the work of the Screen Archive South East and its effort to collect and publicize (through digitization) lantern artefacts for educational and research purposes. The first day of the conference concluded with the 'academic launch' of the LUCERNA database, <<http://slides.uni-trier.de>>. The developer of the database, Richard Crangle, impressed the participants with a practical

demonstration. The database brings together various primary and secondary source materials on the history of the magic lantern. The open access database is an attempt to lay the foundation for future research by de-privatizing sources such as slides, texts, and readings.

The second day started with the panel 'Raising Public Awareness of Living Conditions in Slums and Tenements'. Vogl-Bienek presented a paper entitled 'Slum Life and Living Conditions of the Poor in Fictional and Documentary Lantern Slide Sets'. He differentiated between the life model slides, which presented narratives on the living conditions of the poor, and documentary sets, which claimed to show 'realistic' images of street life and big city slums. He reflected on the concept of a seemingly 'virtual inclusion' of the respectable poor, depicted in different ways by different producers according to their liberal or conservative points of view. In their paper 'Poetry of Poverty: The Magic Lantern and the Ballads of George R. Sims', Joss Marsh (Bloomington) and David Francis (Bloomington) stressed the social relevance of Victorian author George R. Sims, whose ballads brought the poor into the homes of his middle-class readers and gave the disreputable and desperate a voice. Sims was characterized as 'the quintessential multi-media celebrity of Victorian London' because of the various genres in which the prolific writer worked (theatre, poetry, social investigation) and the large number of adaptations of his stories for lantern slide series. After this portrayal of fictionalized representations of poverty, curator Bonnie Yochelson (New York) spoke on 'Jacob Riis, his Photographs, and Poverty in New York, 1888-1914'. Riis is mostly remembered today for his book *How the Other Half Lives* (1890) and its photographic illustrations. What is less well known is that until his death in 1914 he devoted several months of each year to delivering nationwide lantern slide lectures on New York slums. Yochelson pointed out that Riis used photographs as material evidence of the living conditions of the poor to authenticate his reports. For this purpose he and the amateur photographers accompanying him undertook 'raids' on New York slums and immigrant tenements. The subsequent panel discussion reflected on interconnections between art, philanthropy, and business. Visual representations, specifically, photographs of the poor created by middle-class producers for middle-class audiences, were questioned as exploiting or expropriating the poor. Investigations of magic

## Conference Reports

lantern slides and shows on social topics need to take this aspect of exclusion into account.

The third panel dealt with 'Education and Entertainment for the Poor: The Use of Lantern Shows and Early Films by Charity Organizations'. In her presentation 'Educating *Moyshe*: Jewish Socialists, Gentile Entertainments, and the Future of the Jewish Immigrant Masses in America', Judith Thissen (Utrecht) made clear that the educated elites often distrusted the efforts of early film to school the working-class 'masses'. Her detailed case study of the socialist Jewish daily *Forverts* revealed that Jewish intellectuals and labour leaders in turn-of-the-century New York rejected the notion that cinema had any educational value. Instead they relied on the high-brow form of Yiddish literary drama to educate *Moyshe* (the Jewish mass audience) while the 'uneducated' masses themselves embraced the low-brow cultural forms of moving pictures, penny arcades, and the phonograph. The subsequent discussion of Thissen's paper clarified that the use of media by social movements is an open research question (known examples draw quite divergent pictures) that requires international comparative research. Looking at British and German Christmas films, Caroline Henkes (Trier) analysed narrative strategies used to evoke compassion from the audience. She applied an intermedial framework to demonstrate how these Christmas films adopted 'various modes of representation from the established visualization techniques of the magic lantern', comparing them with lantern-slide sets that illustrated the same stories. Intermediality and the repetition of certain tropes in pauper narratives were the subject of subsequent discussion. Frank Gray commented on the often neglected need for material evidence as the 'bedrock' of research and required for understanding new media phenomena such as cinematography in historical context. He stressed the importance of repetition for certain representational strategies in narratives on poverty with similar depictions of the poor repeated across media borders and often featuring death and ascension to heaven as their resolution (like several Christmas stories). The second day concluded with the live magic lantern performance 'Tidings of Comfort and Joy: A Festive and True-Made Victorian Magic Lantern Show for the Deserving Poor of London' given at the Foundling Museum by showman Mervyn Heard accompanied by Juliette Harcourt (recitation and song) and Stephen Horne (piano).

The fourth and final panel was entitled 'Social Prevention with the Aid of the Screen and Exhibitions'. Annemarie McAllister (Preston) spoke on 'The Use of the Magic Lantern in the Band of Hope', Britain's largest temperance organization for young members. In their weekly meetings, magic lantern performances combined instruction and entertainment to reinforce the message of abstinence and to show the evils of strong drink, which was considered one of the main causes of poverty. McAllister outlined the development of the extensive lantern department set up by the UK Band of Hope Union which lent lanterns, slides, and readings to its local branches, British colonies, and the European continent. Marina Dahlquist (Stockholm) spoke of philanthropic organizations in the United States and their use of moving pictures and lantern slides in health campaigns. She showed that these organizations devised veritable multi-media campaigns to promote sanitary measures and to warn the inhabitants of slums and overcrowded living quarters about health hazards. These activities were also intended to encourage the Americanization of immigrants. Michelle Lamunière (Harvard) presented a paper entitled 'Sentiment as Moral Motivator: From Jacob Riis's Lantern Slide Presentations to Harvard University's Social Museum'. She analysed Riis's sensationalist imagery as a tactic to engage audiences for social reform by appealing to 'familiar cultural symbols and prejudices'. Lamunière contrasted them with exhibits from the collection of Harvard University's Social Museum founded by Francis Greenwood Peabody in 1903. The collection of 4,500 photographs and 1,500 related items provides empirical data 'to facilitate the comparative study of social problems and the institutions and methods devised to alleviate them in Europe and America'. In his comment, Scott Curtis (Evanston) discussed the role of the image in education. The extensive use of visual media in social instruction and prevention was based on a widely held belief that images could establish a direct and immediate connection with the mind of the 'uneducated' or the child. Participants also stressed, however, that the combination of sound (text) and image as an inherent feature of lantern performances should be taken into account. A comparison of the different ways of presenting images of the poor to the well-to-do clarified that they appealed not only to their social conscience but also to their self-interest: poverty could pose a threat to their own security and health.

## Conference Reports

Closing remarks by Ian Christie (London) and Clemens Zimmermann (Saarbrücken) directed the concluding discussion towards methodological requirements. The history of the cultural establishment of the screen and its influence on social history, as so impressively demonstrated by the papers delivered at this conference, needs international research to be better coordinated. More empirical data is necessary to answer economic, political, technical, and design questions and to enable audience research. Comparative analysis of historical screen practice (lantern and early cinema) within the wider context of social and cultural history requires micro-analytical approaches based on an internationally agreed research agenda. The participants felt confident that this conference had taken a crucial step towards this end.

LYDIA JAKOBS (University of Trier)

*Ninth Workshop on Early Modern Central European History.* Conference co-organized by the German History Society, the German Historical Institute London, and the National University of Ireland, Maynooth and held at the GHIL, 9 Dec. 2011.

The German Historical Institute London witnessed a small but happy rebirth early in December with the return of the workshop on Early Modern Central European History after a year's absence. The workshop brought together twenty-three early modernists from Germany, Ireland, the United States, Italy, and the United Kingdom. Ten papers exploring new aspects of the history of medicine, cultural history, early modern religious culture, and politics were delivered and discussed at this ninth assembly of scholars. A common theme in many of the papers was communication on a broad, transnational scale and in close readings of historical sources as the repository of communicative processes. As in the eighth workshop held in 2009, the geographical scope of the papers was extended from Germany and Central Europe to embrace a wider European and even extra-European perspective, with some papers exploring relationships between Germany and Italy, Britain, Transylvania, and Constantinople.

After a welcome from organizers David Lederer (National University of Ireland, Maynooth) and Angela Schattner (GHIL), the first session began with two papers on imperial medicine. Ulrich Schlegelmilch (Institute for the History of Medicine, Würzburg) introduced the impressive project 'Frühneuzeitliche Ärztebriefe', a database of all the available letters written or received by early modern physicians in the German-speaking territories from 1500 to 1700 CE. Compiled from archives and libraries all over Europe, the database's extensive abstracts and keywording provide access to relevant topics discussed by physicians in the 'pre-journal period'. Schlegelmilch provided some examples in which German-speaking physicians discussed theological questions, personal travel, and, of course, health issues. This database, whose contents cover almost every topic of early modern life, will also allow a full-text search. Coming on-line in 2012,<sup>1</sup> the fifteen-year project is a collaboration between the Munich

The full conference programme can be found on the GHIL's website <[www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)> under Events and Conferences.

<sup>1</sup> To be found at <[www.aerztebriefe.de](http://www.aerztebriefe.de)>.

## Conference Reports

Academy of Sciences and the Würzburg Institute of the History of Medicine.

Demonstrating the richness of historiography soon to become available, Hannah Murphy (University of California, Berkeley) in her paper on 'Medical Reformation in Sixteenth-Century Nuremberg' traced the progress of internal and external changes in the practice of medicine in that municipality. She illustrated the growing authority of academically educated municipal physicians and, perhaps not coincidentally, a growing consensus among these physicians on the threat posed by 'bad' medicine (that is, fraud, quackery, and Paracelsianism). Taking as a starting point the submission by Joachim Camerarius to the Nuremberg Inner Council for the establishment of a Collegium Medicum, Murphy outlined the negotiations this provoked and the nature of medical authority created by the physicians. When the Collegium was established, it privileged its members' medical practices through legal and social constructions which are conventionally presented as part of the macro-development of public hygiene. At the time, however, creating legal categories of acceptable medical thought and unacceptable medical 'heresy' was highly contentious. Formal relationships between patients, physicians, and polity which were established in the process continue to this day, including the sharing of case studies between physicians and the necessity for a 'second opinion' in diagnosis. They also contributed substantially to the establishment of a medical elite.

The second session, chaired by Felicity Heal (University of Oxford), saw a change in focus to exchange and conflicted communication. Peter Burschel (Humboldt University of Berlin) spoke on 'Diplomatic Gift-Giving from an Intercultural Perspective' and Daniela Hacke (University of Zurich) presented a paper on 'Religious Coexistence and Difference: Confession, Communication, and Conflict in the Swiss Confederation (1531-1712)'. Burschel explored an encounter between the gift-giving systems of two seventeenth-century empires, the Ottoman and the Austrian, during Habsburg emissary Hans Ludwig von Kuefstein's visit to Sultan Murad IV in Constantinople in 1628. Before his audience, Kuefstein was urged by the Grand Vizier's deputy to upgrade the quality of his gifts or risk having them derisively dismissed. Although Kuefstein refused, the audience was successful, but the customary parting gifts were not given to the ambassador, and the Peace of Zsitvatorok, which Kuefstein was in Con-



stantinople to renew, remained unaddressed. In his journal, Kuefstein ascribed the unexpected demand to Ottoman avarice, but from the perspective of historical anthropology, gift-giving is about symbolic power. While different gift-giving systems reflect different social economies, Burschel demonstrated that the demand for 'gift improvement' was an attempt on the part of the Ottomans to symbolically transform the Austrians back into tribute-paying vassals. This was a characteristic feature of the Ottoman system of gift-giving, which positioned the quality of the gift as a sign of the strength and power of the recipient (not the giver), and in which the notion of a gift-giving obligation was intended to honour the office (not the person). Kuefstein, perhaps unwittingly, further defined Austria's independence from the Ottoman Empire by his refusal to meet the Grand Vizier's gift-giving demands.

Negotiations over definitions of status and identity were also addressed by Hacke in her presentation of research conducted for her *Habilitationsschrift*, in which she analysed confessional encounters in bi-confessional villages of the County of Baden during the early modern period. In Baden's complex situation, where three out of eight Confederates were Protestant, the remainder Catholic, and members of each confession regularly encountered the other (in, for example, shared churches), confession represented a significant structural principle for distinction at micro-, macro-, and meso-levels. Convergence often intensified awareness of difference, leading to confession-based claims of authority which, because personal meetings of the ruling states of the County of Baden were infrequent, were negotiated politically in protracted correspondences. Hacke examined this medium of negotiation supported by a sociological perspective marking the contingency of communication and found that the writings were also a means by which confessional differences were appropriated, articulated, and assigned. Communication itself manufactured differences between Protestants and Catholics, building distinct and contingent confessional identities in daily life and the visual and material cultures of churches.

The first session of the afternoon, chaired by Angela Schattner (GHIL), brought together three papers devoted to cultural representations of religious conviction. In her presentation on 'Piety, Patronage, Politics: Monastic Music in Early Modern Germany', Barbara Eichner (Oxford Brookes University) drew attention to the neglected

## Conference Reports

role of music in southern German religious houses between 1550 and 1610. With the aid of case studies from Benedictine and Cistercian monasteries and nunneries, Eichner traced the dynamic between religious conflict and musical practice, with music serving political as well as cultural purposes. Specific compositions travelled between houses of the same confession, with strong connections between the Benedictine houses of southern Germany and northern Italy demonstrating early modern networks of communication and cultural exchange. Eichner also introduced the notion of monastic music as a gendered practice, showing that the enclosed communities of both sexes appreciated music, performed it, and hired external musical instructors, but that the severity of restrictions on instructors of the opposite sex, particularly for nunneries, may have depended on where the house was located (urban or rural, Italy or Germany).

Jacob M. Baum (University of Illinois/Institute of European History, Mainz), speaking on 'The Rosary, Synthaesthesia, and Early German Reformation', portrayed the condemnation of the rosary in the early Protestant Reformation as a rejection of multi-sensory worship practices characteristic of fifteenth century German-speaking territories. Presenting a chapter of his dissertation, he demonstrated the ubiquitous and multi-sensory nature of pre-Reformation rosary use through the records of merchant trading companies, charters for local chapters of the Confraternity of the Rosary, municipal sumptuary laws, rosary prayer books, the use of *Bisamäpfeln*, and visual evidence from family portraiture. While Catholic perceptions of the practice ascribed miraculous power and positioned its use as mediating between human bodies and the Mass, Baum provided explicit Protestant theological condemnations of the rosary, which culminated in its legal prohibition from Zurich in 1522 and Berne in 1528.

In a paper entitled 'Baroque Architecture as a Place of Interaction', Britta Kägler (German Historical Institute Rome) presented the early stages of her postdoctoral project, which unites the disparate fields of economic and cultural history—specifically, interaction between economy and art—by investigating the process of erecting Baroque ecclesiastical structures (Hochstiftische Zentralkirchen) in early modern Bavaria. Noting that the Baroque style resulted from a Papal decision to communicate religious themes artistically, Kägler will research the use of these buildings, and the intentions and pursuits of their patrons through communication and representation. Her sources will

include the material remains of historical monuments and archival material, including account books, correspondence, and so forth.

Chaired by Michael Schaich (GHIL), the final session dealt with the common theme of communication, its three papers focusing on 'Religion, Politics, and Communication'. Holger Zaunstöck (Frankesche Stiftungen zu Halle) presented a current research project scrutinizing the conceptual structure of Pietist media culture from 1690 to 1750 in his paper 'Making "Pietism": England, the Halle Orphanage and the Construction of a Transnational Communication Culture'. Examining books, newspapers, periodicals, images, instructions for behaviour, and the architecture of the Halle orphanage, Zaunstöck portrayed Pietism as an attempt to create God's Kingdom by the communication of ideas, describing the movement as a media creation. Although the organizational centre was near Halle, London was a key hub of exchange for Pietist ideas, and records from the orphanage in Halle and from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge at the University of Cambridge constitute most of the relevant source material. While large-scale networks between individuals and partner institutions established a public sphere characterized by values of care and compassion presenting an attractive alternative to Enlightenment values of criticism and reason, Zaunstöck posited that the media in question were conceptually regarded as an attempt to make the reform movement visible without being labelled explicitly as 'Pietist'.

The second paper of the session, by Heinrich Lang (University of Bamberg), was entitled 'Episcopal States and Reforms in the Late Eighteenth Century: Prince-Bishop Franz Ludwig von Erthal of Würzburg-Bamberg and the Catholic Enlightenment'. Lang presented his current research project, undertaken with Christian Kuhn, also of the University of Bamberg. They are exploring the changing status and nature of the Catholic bishop-prince at the conclusion of the Seven Years War in the context of the Enlightenment and reform states. Pursuing both central and grassroots perspectives, Land presented a multi-dimensional case study of Franz Ludwig von Erthal of Würzburg-Bamberg as an exemplar of the role, whose impulses towards advanced educational institutions and industrial structure characterized the policies of enlightened princes, while he simultaneously met clearly defined Catholic standards of pastoral care and religious integrity.

## Conference Reports

The session concluded with Virginia Dillon's (University of Oxford) presentation of her Ph.D. project, 'Transylvania in the German News: György II Rákóczi's Invasion and Dismissal, 1657'. Her research examines patterns and distinctions in the reported news stories of a closely followed campaign, based on where they originated and in what media they were presented. She uses both quantitative and qualitative methods of textual analysis in order to determine what themes and images recur and whether they coincide with particular story subjects, reporting locations, or type of media. Dillon has found that two narratives are available, depending on whether the municipal source of the report was an interior or a coastal city. She also reported on the broad array of print media available at the time, and on the state of the news industry for that year.

All the papers were followed by discussion, and the workshop itself concluded with a roundtable chaired by Andreas Gestrich, in which questions of a fresh 'master narrative' for early modern German history, or a new research agenda, were brought up. A point was raised about the role of the internet in expanding research horizons; although methodologies are still in flux, different opportunities and questions are developing from inter-disciplinary perspectives which may point in a new direction. This year's workshop is scheduled for 26 October.

LINNÉA ROWLATT (University of Kent/Freie Universität Berlin)

## NOTICEBOARD

### Scholarships Awarded by the GHIL

Each year the GHIL awards a number of research scholarships to German postgraduate and postdoctoral students to enable them to carry out research in Britain, and to British postgraduates for research visits to Germany. Scholarships are generally awarded for a period of up to six months, depending on the requirements of the research project. British applicants will normally be expected to have completed one years postgraduate research, and be studying German history or Anglo-German relations. Scholarships are advertised on H-Soz-u-Kult and the GHIL's website and are allocated twice a year. Applications, which should include a CV, educational background, list of publications (where appropriate), and an outline of the project, together with a supervisor's reference confirming the relevance of the proposed archival research, should be addressed to the Administrative Director, German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ.

During their stay in Britain, German scholars present their projects and the initial results of their research at the GHIL Colloquium. In the first allocation for 2012 the following scholarships were awarded for research on British history, German history, and Anglo-German relations.

*Nicolas Berg* (Freiburg/Leipzig): Völkerpsychologie, Wirtschaftsstil und jüdische Kollektivität: Nationalökonomische Debatten des 19. Jahrhunderts

*Eva Catharina Heesen* (Hanover): Adolph Friedrich, Herzog von Cambridge als Generalgouverneur und Vizekönig von Hannover

*Sabine Kehren* (Bonn): Die Formulierung der britischen Iranpolitik 1946–54

*Razak Khan* (Berlin): Languages of Governance and Contestations: Political Culture in Rampur 1889–1949

*Berti Kolbow* (Göttingen): Transatlantische Transfers der Marketing-Konzepte zwischen Eastman Kodak und Agfa, 1880–1945

## Noticeboard

- Daniel Lange* (Berlin): Schreibende Piraten: Britische Bukaniere und ihre Reiseberichte (1684–99)
- Sebastian Meurer* (Heidelberg): The Language of Administrative Reform in the British Empire, 1780–1830
- Franziska Reinfeldt* (Berlin): Ralf Dahrendorf: Ein Intellektueller in der Geschichte der Bundesrepublik
- Cathleen Sarti* (Mainz): Diskussion und Praxis von Herrscher-Absetzungen im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert im protestantischen Nord-europa (England, Schottland, Schweden und die Niederlande)
- Immo Warntjes* (Greifswald): Königs- und Fürstenerhebungen in England und im Reich c.1250–1530: Ein Vergleich zweier spätmittelalterlicher Kulturen
- Silvia Wershofen* (Kassel): Die Jacobites und Preußen: Friedrich II. und der Elibank Plot, 1750–53

## Postgraduate Students' Conference

The German Historical Institute London held its sixteenth postgraduate students' conference on 12–13 Jan. 2012. Its intention was to give postgraduate research students in the UK and Ireland working on German history an opportunity to present their work-in-progress, and to discuss it with other students working in the same or a similar field. The conference opened with words of welcome by the Deputy Director of the GHIL, Benedikt Stuchtey. Over the next one and a half days, nineteen speakers introduced their projects to an interested and engaged audience. The sessions were mostly devoted to the nineteenth century, the First World War, the inter-war period, the Third Reich, and the post-1945 period. Participants gave a short summary of their work containing general ideas, leading questions, sources, and initial findings, followed by discussion. Again it became clear that the palaeography course tutored by Dorothea McEwan, which had preceded the conference, was particularly well received. Information about institutions that give grants for research in Germany was also exchanged. The GHIL can offer support here by facilitating contact with German archives and providing letters of introduction, which may be necessary for students to gain access to archives or specific source collections. In certain cases it may help students to make con-

tact with particular German universities and professors. The GHIL is planning to hold the next postgraduate students' conference early in 2013. For further information, including how to apply, please contact the Secretary, Anita Bellamy, German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ.

*Martin Albers* (Cambridge): British and German Relations with China, 1969–1982

*Arddun Hedydd Arwyn* (Aberystwyth): The Social Memory and Historical Culture of East and West Prussians in the Federal Republic of Germany, 1949–2009

*Kinga Bloch* (UCL): Television Families in Cold War Europe: A Comparative Study of Polish, East and West German Television Series

*Thomas Brodie* (Oxford): Catholicism on Germany's Home Front in the Second World War

*Rachel Century* (Royal Holloway, London): Typing for the Third Reich

*Zhong Zhong Chen* (LSE): Between Political Pragmatism and Moscow's Watchful Eye: East German–Chinese Relations in the 1980s

*Gaelle Fisher* (UCL): From Survival to Belonging: Narratives of Loss, Suffering and New Beginning among German Speakers from Romania

*Max Haberich* (Cambridge): Arthur Schnitzler's *Professor Bernhardi*: Anti-Semitism on the Stage and in Reality

*Mads Jensen* (UCL): Political Order and Authority in the German Reformation

*Mahon Murphy* (LSE): Rum, Solitary and the Lash: Violence against German Prisoners in the Colonies during World War One

*Clare Murray* (Manchester): Beyond Presence/Absence in the Built Environment of Post-Unification Berlin

*Shane Nagle* (Royal Holloway, London): Historical Narratives in European Nationalisms: The Cases of Germany and Ireland Compared, 1840–1933

*Helen Roche* (Cambridge): Personal and Political Appropriations of Sparta in German Elite Education during the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries

*Diana Siclovan* (Cambridge): Lorenz Stein and the Place of Socialism in the German Political Imagination, c.1835–70

*Victoria Stiles* (Nottingham): German Perceptions of the British Empire, 1939–45

## Noticeboard

*Hanna Weibye* (Cambridge): Friedrich Ludwig Jahn und German Nationalism: 1800–19

*Waseem Yaqoob* (Cambridge): Hannah Arendt: History and Judgement  
*Astrid Zajdband* (University of Sussex): German Rabbis in British Exile and their Influence on Judaism in Britain

*David Zell* (Kingston University, London): The Bicentennial of Beethoven's Birth in the 1970s and the Significance of Classical Music in the Political System of the GDR

## Prize of the German Historical Institute London

The Prize of the German Historical Institute London is awarded annually for an outstanding Ph.D. thesis on German history (submitted to a British or Irish university), British history (submitted to a German university), Anglo-German relations, or an Anglo-German comparative topic. The Prize is 1,000 euros. In 2011 the prize was awarded to David Motadel for 'Germany's Policy towards Islam, 1941–45', submitted to the University of Cambridge.

To be eligible a thesis must have been submitted to a British, Irish, or German university after 30 June 2011. To apply, send one copy of the thesis with

- a one-page abstract
- examiners' reports on the thesis
- a brief CV
- a declaration that the author will allow it to be considered for publication in the Institute's German-language series, and that the work will not be published before the judges have reached a final decision
- a supervisor's reference

to reach the Director of the German Historical Institute London, 17 Bloomsbury Square, London WC1A 2NJ, by 30 June 2012. The Prize will be presented on the occasion of the Institute's Annual Lecture (date to be confirmed).

For further information visit: [www.ghil.ac.uk](http://www.ghil.ac.uk)

Email: [ghil@ghil.ac.uk](mailto:ghil@ghil.ac.uk) Tel: 020 7309 2050



### **Forthcoming Conferences**

*Poverty in Modern Europe: Micro-Perspectives on the Formation of the Welfare State in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries.* Joint conference of the German Historical Institute London and the DFG Collaborative Research Centre 600 'Strangers and Poor People', University of Trier, to be held at the GHIL, 10–12 May 2012.

One of the fundamental processes in nineteenth-century European history was the development of the modern welfare state. While nineteenth-century social policy initially intended merely to alleviate the worst side effects of industrialization, the welfare state ultimately offered its citizens an unprecedented degree of social security. Modern social policy, however, shares the characteristic ambivalence of modern societies in that they not only establish greater opportunities for participation, but also create new ways of controlling individuals in order to sanction, normalize, scientifically explain, or, in extreme cases, eradicate deviant behaviour.

The conference will ask how these overarching processes of modernization and the inclusions and exclusions they implied influenced the everyday lives of the poor. Instead of focusing on well-researched macro-trends, the conference will present local and regional case studies from a micro-perspective. It will look at regional variations within welfare systems. Particular attention will be paid to peripheral rural regions and to social groups living on the margins of society, such as the unemployed, the homeless, and pauper orphans. Topics of interest also include regional and local perceptions of poverty, everyday practices of granting and refusing relief, and relations between public welfare, philanthropy, and networks of solidarity. This also involves questions about processes of modernization and professionalization in local and regional welfare systems.

## Noticeboard

*Dynastic Politics, Monarchical Representation and the Union between Hanover and Britain.* Joint Conference of the German Historical Institute London and the Historische Kommission für Niedersachsen and Bremen, to be held at the GHIL, 11–13 Oct. 2012.

The year 2014 marks the tercentenary of the succession of the Hanoverian dynasty to the British throne in 1714 and the start of the personal union between Britain and Hanover which created a link between the two countries that lasted for more than a hundred years until 1837. In order to commemorate this event the Historische Kommission für Niedersachsen and Bremen and the German Historical Institute London are jointly organizing two international conferences in 2012 to be held in Osnabrück and London respectively. Taken together the two conferences will provide a comprehensive analysis of the history of the personal union within its European, British, and German contexts. While the Osnabrück meeting, which took place at the end of March, concentrated on the origins of the personal union within the European state system around 1700 and on the impact of the personal union on north west Germany, the emphasis of the London conference will be on the British side of the personal union, focusing on monarchical representation, dynastic politics, and cultural transfers. There will be sessions on the Hanoverian monarchs' visions of kingship and court culture, the implications of the pronounced Protestantism of the dynasty for a confessionally diverse nation, popular and elite attitudes to the foreign rulers on the British throne, the exchange of ideas and concepts between Britain and Germany within the framework of the personal union, and, finally, the putative legacies of the personal union. For further information please contact Michael Schaich, GHIL (schaich@ghil.ac.uk).

*Tenth Workshop on Early Modern German History.* Conference organized by the German History Society in cooperation with the German Historical Institute London, to be held at the GHIL, 26 Oct. 2012.

The first workshop was held in 2002, and this event has now established itself as the principal forum for cross-disciplinary discussion

of new research on early modern German-speaking Central Europe. Previous themes have included artistic and literary representations, medicine and musicology, political, social, economic, and religious history. Contributions are also welcome from those wishing to range outside the period generally considered as 'early modern' and those engaged in comparative research on other parts of early modern Europe.

The day will be organized as a series of themed panels, each introduced by a chair and consisting of two or three short papers followed by discussion. The point of the papers is to present new findings or work-in-progress in summary form, rather than extended detailed discussion. Accordingly, participants are encouraged to keep to a time limit of 10–15 minutes, highlight major findings or questions, and indicate how work might develop in the future.

If you are interested in presenting a paper, please send a short synopsis and a CV by 30 June to David Lederer, Senior Lecturer, Department of History, National University of Ireland Maynooth, Co. Kildare, Ireland (dlederer@nuim.ie). For further information please contact Angela Schattner, GHIL (schattner@ghil.ac.uk).

*'Tales about time': Temporality, Modernity and the Order of Time.* Workshop to be held at the GHIL, 29–30 Nov. 2012. Convener: Fernando Esposito.

The fact that time itself changes over time may be obvious, perhaps even trivial. Nevertheless, as historians we are among the main protagonists actually mapping, moulding, and ordering time, and so it is essential that we reflect on how we actually deal with time. The workshop aims to tackle this difficult task by challenging the very notions and concepts which historians rely on to make time itself a subject. We will go on to problematize modernity as a specific mindset which focuses on time and chronopolitics. The main presupposition underlying the workshop is that modernities can be grasped, among other things, as 'tales about time' (Thomas Mann). For further information please contact Fernando Esposito, University of Tübingen (fernando.esposito@uni-tuebingen.de).

## LIBRARY NEWS

### Recent Acquisitions

This list contains a selection of recent publications in German and English, primarily on German history, acquired by the GHIL library in the past year.

- Adorno, Theodor Wiesengrund, *Guilt and Defense: On the Legacies of National Socialism in Postwar Germany*, trans., ed., and intro. Jeffrey K. Olick and Andrew J. Perrin (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2010)
- Althoff, Gerd (ed.), *Frieden stiften: Vermittlung und Konfliktlösung vom Mittelalter bis heute* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2011)
- Althoff, Gerd and Christel Meier, *Ironie im Mittelalter: Hermeneutik, Dichtung, Politik* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2011)
- Aly, Götz, *Warum die Deutschen? Warum die Juden? Gleichheit, Neid und Rassenhass 1800–1933* (2nd edn. Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 2011)
- Anderson, Jeffrey and Eric Langenbacher (eds.), *From the Bonn to the Berlin Republic: Germany at the Twentieth Anniversary of Unification* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010)
- Anderson, Perry, *The New Old World* (London: Verso, 2011)
- Andrian-Werburg, Victor Franz Freiherr von, *‘Österreich wird meine Stimme erkennen lernen wie die Stimme Gottes in der Wüste’: Tagebücher 1839–1858*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Neuere Geschichte Österreichs, 98, 3 vols. (Vienna: Böhlau, 2011)
- Arndt, Agnes, Joachim C. Häberlen, and Christiane Reinecke (eds.), *Vergleichen, Verflechten, Verwirren? Europäische Geschichtsschreibung zwischen Theorie und Praxis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Arnold, Jörg, *The Allied Air War and Urban Memory: The Legacy of Strategic Bombing in Germany*, Studies in the Social and Cultural History of Modern Warfare, 35 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

- Bade, Klaus J., Pieter C. Emmer, et al. (eds.), *The Encyclopedia of Migration and Minorities in Europe: From the Seventeenth Century to the Present* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Bajohr, Frank and Christoph Strupp (eds.), *Fremde Blicke auf das 'Dritte Reich': Berichte ausländischer Diplomaten über Herrschaft und Gesellschaft in Deutschland 1933–1945*, *Hamburger Beiträge zur Sozial- und Zeitgeschichte*, 49 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2011)
- Bartmuß, Hans-Joachim and Josef Ulfkotte, *Nach dem Turnverbot: 'Turnvater' Jahn zwischen 1819 und 1852* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2011)
- Baumgart, Winfried with the assistance of Axel T. G. Riehl (eds.), *Bismarck und der deutsche Kolonialerwerb 1883–1885: Eine Quellensammlung*, *Quellen und Forschungen zur Brandenburgischen und Preussischen Geschichte*, 40 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2011)
- Becker, Rainald, Daniel Burger, et al. (eds.), *Akteure, Beziehungen, Ideen: Bayerische Geschichte im interterritorialen Zusammenhang. Festschrift für Alois Schmid zum 65. Geburtstag* (Kallmünz: Laßleben, 2010)
- Bellingradt, Daniel, *Flugpublizistik und Öffentlichkeit um 1700: Dynamiken, Akteure und Strukturen im urbanen Raum des Alten Reiches*, *Beiträge zur Kommunikationsgeschichte*, 26 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011)
- Benz, Wolfgang, *'Der ewige Jude': Metaphern und Methoden nationalsozialistischer Propaganda, Dokumente, Texte, Materialien/Zentrum für Antisemitismusforschung der Technischen Universität Berlin*, 75 (Berlin: Metropol Verlag, 2010)
- Berger, Michael and Gideon Römer-Hillebrecht (eds.), *Jüdische Soldaten, jüdischer Widerstand: In Deutschland und Frankreich* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2012)
- Bezemek, Ernst and Michael Dippelreiter, *Politische Eliten in Niederösterreich: Ein biografisches Handbuch 1921 bis zur Gegenwart*, *Schriftenreihe des Forschungsinstitutes für politisch-historische Studien der Dr.-Wilfried-Haslauer-Bibliothek Salzburg*, 38 (Vienna: Böhlau, 2011)
- Blatman, Daniel, *The Death Marches: The Final Phase of Nazi Genocide*, trans. Chaya Galai (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011)
- Bleek, Wilhelm, *Friedrich Christoph Dahlmann: Eine Biografie* (Munich: Beck, 2010)

## Library News

- Bloxham, Donald and Robert Gerwarth (eds.), *Political Violence in Twentieth-Century Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Boehling, Rebecca and Uta Larkey, *Life and Loss in the Shadow of the Holocaust: A Jewish Family's Untold Story* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Borgolte, Michael, Julia Dücker, et al. (eds.), *Integration und Desintegration der Kulturen im europäischen Mittelalter*, Europa im Mittelalter, 18 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011)
- Brenner, Michael, *Prophets of the Past: Interpreters of Jewish History*, trans. Steven Randall (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010)
- Brenner, Michael, *A Short History of the Jews*, trans. Jeremiah Riemer (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010)
- Budde, Gunilla-Friederike (ed.), *Kapitalismus: Historische Annäherungen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Bührer, Tanja, Christiane Stachelbeck, and Dierk Walter (eds.), *Imperialkriege von 1500 bis heute: Strukturen, Akteure, Lernprozesse* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2011)
- Bues, Almut, *Die Jagiellonen: Herrscher zwischen Ostsee und Adria* (Berlin: Kohlhammer, 2010)
- Bukey, Evan Burr, *Jews and Inter-marriage in Nazi Austria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Burhop, Carsten, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Kaiserreichs 1871-1918* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Burschel, Peter and Christoph Marx (eds.), *Reinheit*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Historische Anthropologie, 12 (Vienna: Böhlau, 2011)
- Carl, Horst and Hans-Jürgen Bömelburg (eds.), *Lohn der Gewalt: Beutepraktiken von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*, Krieg in der Geschichte, 72 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2011)
- Cepl-Kaufmann, Gertrude and Georg Mölich (eds.), *Konstruktionsprozesse der Region in europäischer Perspektive: Kulturelle Raumprägungen der Moderne*, Düsseldorfer Schriften zur Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaft, 6 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2010)
- Cerman, Ivo, *Habsburgischer Adel und Aufklärung: Bildungsverhalten des Wiener Hofadels im 18. Jahrhundert*, Contubernium, 72 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2010)

Recent Acquisitions

- Chatriot, Alain and Dieter Gosewinkel (eds.), *Koloniale Politik und Praktiken Deutschlands und Frankreichs 1880–1962*, Schriftenreihe des Deutsch-Französischen Historikerkomitees, 6 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2010)
- Clancy-Smith, Julia Ann, *Mediterraneans: North Africa and Europe in an Age of Migration, c.1800–1900*, California World History Library, 15 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011)
- Conrad, Sebastian, *German Colonialism: A Short History*, trans. Sorcha O’Hagan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- Conrad, Sebastian, *The Quest for the Lost Nation: Writing History in Germany and Japan in the American Century*, trans. Alan Nothnagle, California World History Library, 12 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2010)
- Conway, Stephen, *Britain, Ireland, and Continental Europe in the Eighteenth Century: Similarities, Connections, Identities* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Cook, Chris, *The Routledge Guide to European Political Archives: Sources since 1945* (London: Routledge, 2012)
- Dahlke, Matthias, *Demokratischer Staat und transnationaler Terrorismus: Drei Wege zur Unnachgiebigkeit in Westeuropa 1972–1975*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 90 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Dahlmann, Dittmar and Margrit Schulte Beerbühl (eds.), *Perspektiven in der Fremde? Arbeitsmarkt und Migration von der Frühen Neuzeit bis in die Gegenwart*, Migration in Geschichte und Gegenwart, 6 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2011)
- Deinhardt, André, *Panzergrrenadiere im Kalten Krieg: Die Geschichte einer Truppengattung zwischen ‘Massive Retaliation’ und ‘Flexible Response’, 1960 bis 1970*, Sicherheitspolitik und Streitkräfte der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 11 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)
- Dennis, Mike and Norman LaPorte, *State and Minorities in Communist East Germany*, Monographs in German History, 33 (New York: Berghahn Books, 2011)
- Descharmes, Bernadette, Eric Anton Heuser, et al. (eds.), *Varieties of Friendship: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Social Relationships*, Freunde, Gönner, Getreue, 1 (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2011)

## Library News

- Dinçkal, Noyan, Christof Dipper, and Detlev Mares (eds.), *Selbstmobilisierung der Wissenschaft: Technische Hochschulen im 'Dritten Reich'*, Edition Universität der Wissenschaftlichen Buchgesellschaft und der TU Darmstadt mit der Carlo und Karin Giersch-Stiftung (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2010)
- Diner, Dan (ed.), *Enzyklopädie jüdischer Geschichte und Kultur*, i. A-CI. (Stuttgart, Weimar: Metzler, 2011)
- Duchhardt, Heinz (ed.), *Der Pyrenäenfriede 1659: Vorgeschichte, Widerhall, Rezeptionsgeschichte*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, Beiheft 83 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010)
- Echternkamp, Jörg and Stefan Martens (eds.), *Experience and Memory: The Second World War in Europe*, Studies in Contemporary European History, 7 (New York: Berghahn, 2010)
- Ferguson, Niall, *Civilization: The West and the Rest* (London: Allen Lane, 2011)
- Fisch, Jörg et al. (eds.), *Die Verteilung der Welt: Selbstbestimmung und das Selbstbestimmungsrecht der Völker*, Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien 79 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Fischer, Christopher J., *Alsace to the Alsatians? Visions and Divisions of Alsatian Regionalism, 1870-1939*, Studies in Contemporary European History, 5 (New York: Berghahn, 2010)
- Fischer-Kattner, Anke, Matthias Georgi, et al. (eds.), *Schleifspuren: Lesarten des 18. Jahrhunderts. Festschrift für Eckhart Hellmuth* (Munich: Dreesbach, 2011)
- Förster, Birte, *Der Königin Luise-Mythos: Mediengeschichte des 'Idealbilds deutscher Weiblichkeit', 1860-1960*, Formen der Erinnerung, 46 (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2011)
- France, John, *Perilous Glory: The Rise of Western Military Power* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011)
- Frei, Matt, *Berlin, a Clash of Histories: A Personal View*, The Bithell Memorial Lectures, 2010 (London: Institute of Germanic and Romance Studies/University of London School of Advanced Study, 2011)
- Frevert, Ute et al., *Gefühlswissen: Eine lexikalische Spurensuche in der Moderne* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2011)
- Friedrich, Karin and Sara Smart (eds.), *The Cultivation of Monarchy and the Rise of Berlin: Brandenburg-Prussia 1700* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010)



- Fritzsche, Peter, *The Turbulent World of Franz Göll: An Ordinary Berliner Writes the Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011)
- Gailus, Manfred and Daniel Siemens (eds.), *'Hass und Begeisterung bilden Spalier': Die politische Autobiografie von Horst Wessel* (Berlin: be.bra Verlag, 2011)
- Gallus, Alexander and Axel Schildt (eds.), *Rückblickend in die Zukunft: Politische Öffentlichkeit und intellektuelle Positionen in Deutschland um 1950 und um 1930*, Hamburger Beiträge zur Sozial- und Zeitgeschichte, 48 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2011)
- Gehler, Michael, *Deutschland. Von der Teilung zur Einigung: 1945 bis heute* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2010)
- Gerwarth, Robert, *Hitler's Hangman: The Life of Heydrich* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011)
- Giloi, Eva, *Monarchy, Myth, and Material Culture in Germany 1750–1950*, New Studies in European History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Göktürk, Deniz, David Gramling, et al. (eds.), *Transit Deutschland. Debatten zu Nation und Migration: Eine Dokumentation* (Constance: Konstanz University Press, 2011)
- Goll, Jörn-Michael, *Kontrollierte Kontrolleure: Die Bedeutung der Zollverwaltung für die 'politisch-operative Arbeit' des Ministeriums für Staatssicherheit der DDR*, Schriften des Hannah-Arendt-Instituts für Totalitarismusforschung, 44 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Goltz, Anna von der (ed.), *'Talkin' 'bout my generation': Conflicts of Generation Building and Europe's '1968'*, Göttinger Studien zur Generationsforschung, 6 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2011)
- Grashoff, Udo, *Schwarzwohnen: Die Unterwanderung der staatlichen Wohnraumlenkung in der DDR*, Berichte und Studien/Hannah-Arendt-Institut für Totalitarismusforschung, 59 (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2011)
- Greble, Emily, *Sarajevo, 1941–1945: Muslims, Christians, and Jews in Hitler's Europe* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2011)
- Gross, Raphael, *Anständig geblieben: Nationalsozialistische Moral*, Schriftenreihe des Fritz-Bauer-Instituts, 26 (2nd edn. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2010)

## Library News

- Großbölting, Thomas and Rüdiger Schmidt (eds.), *Der Tod des Diktators: Ereignis und Erinnerung im 20. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Hachtmann, Rüdiger, Thomas Schaarschmidt, and Winfried Süß (eds.), *Berlin im Nationalsozialismus: Politik und Gesellschaft 1933–1945*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Nationalsozialismus, 27 (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2011)
- Hacke, Gerald, *Die Zeugen Jehovas im Dritten Reich und in der DDR: Feindbild und Verfolgungspraxis*, Schriften des Hannah-Arendt-Instituts für Totalitarismusforschung, 41 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Hanisch, Ernst, *Der große Illusionist: Otto Bauer (1881–1938)* (Vienna: Böhlau, 2011)
- Hartmann, Peter Claus and Alois Schmid (eds.), *Bayern in Lateinamerika: Transatlantische Verbindungen und interkultureller Austausch*, Zeitschrift für bayerische Landesgeschichte, Beiheft 40 (Munich: Beck, 2011)
- Hasenöhr, Ute, *Zivilgesellschaft und Protest: Eine Geschichte der Naturschutz- und Umweltbewegung in Bayern 1945–1980*, Umwelt und Gesellschaft, 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Hausmann, Frank-Rutger, *Die Geisteswissenschaften im 'Dritten Reich'* (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 2011)
- Haver, Charlotte E., *Von Salzburg nach Amerika: Mobilität und Kultur einer Gruppe religiöser Emigranten im 18. Jahrhundert*, Studien zur historischen Migrationsforschung, 21 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2011)
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*, i. *Manuscripts of the Introduction and the Lectures of 1822–3* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Heinemann, Winfried, *Die DDR und ihr Militär*, Beiträge zur Militärgeschichte: Militärgeschichte kompakt, 3 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Herzog, Dagmar, *Sexuality in Europe: A Twentieth-Century History*, New Approaches to European History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Heschel, Susannah, *The Aryan Jesus: Christian Theologians and the Bible in Nazi Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010)

- Hilger, Andreas (ed.), *Diplomatie für die deutsche Einheit: Dokumente des Auswärtigen Amtes zu den deutsch-sowjetischen Beziehungen 1989/90*, Schriftenreihe der Vierteljahrshefte für Zeitgeschichte, 103 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Hilger, Susanne and Achim Landwehr (eds.), *Wirtschaft, Kultur, Geschichte: Positionen und Perspektiven* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011)
- Hirschi, Caspar, *The Origins of Nationalism: An Alternative History from Ancient Rome to Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)
- Hobsbawm, Eric, *How to Change the World: Marx and Marxism 1840–2011* (London: Little Brown, 2011)
- Hochscherf, Tobias, Christoph Laucht, and Andrew Plowman (eds.), *Divided, but not Disconnected: German Experiences of the Cold War* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2010)
- Hockerts, Hans Günter, *Der deutsche Sozialstaat: Entfaltung und Gefährdung seit 1945*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 199 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Hof, Tobias, *Staat und Terrorismus in Italien 1969–1982*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 81 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Hoffmann, Karsten Dustin, 'Rote Flora': *Ziele, Mittel und Wirkungen eines linksautonomen Zentrums in Hamburg*, Extremismus und Demokratie, 21 (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2011)
- Hoffmann, Peter, *Carl Goerdeler and the Jewish Question, 1933–1942* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Hoffmann, Stefan-Ludwig (ed.), *Human Rights in the Twentieth Century*, Human Rights in History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Israel, Jonathan Irvine, *Democratic Enlightenment: Philosophy, Revolution, and Human Rights 1750–1790* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Jackson, Mark (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Medicine* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Jerram, Leif, *Streetlife: The Untold History of Europe's Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Jones, Gareth Stedman and Gregory Claeys (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Nineteenth-Century Political Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)

## Library News

- Jones, Heather, *Violence against Prisoners of War in the First World War: Britain, France and Germany, 1914–1920*, Studies in the Social and Cultural History of Modern Warfare, 34 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Jucker, Michael, Martin Kitzinger, and Rainer Christoph Schwinges (eds.), *Rechtsformen internationaler Politik: Theorie, Norm und Praxis vom 12. bis 18. Jahrhundert*, Zeitschrift für Historische Forschung, Beiheft 45 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2011)
- Judt, Tony, *The Memory Chalet* (London: Vintage, 2011)
- Jünger, Ernst, *Kriegstagebuch 1914–1918*, ed. Helmuth Kiesel (2nd edn. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 2010)
- Jürgens, Henning P. and Thomas Weller (eds.), *Religion und Mobilität: Zum Verhältnis von raumbezogener Mobilität und religiöser Identitätsbildung im frühneuzeitlichen Europa*, Veröffentlichungen des Instituts für Europäische Geschichte Mainz, Beiheft 81 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010)
- Jütte, Daniel, *Das Zeitalter des Geheimnisses: Juden, Christen und die Ökonomie des Geheimes (1400–1800)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Jütte, Robert, with the assistance of Wolfgang U. Eckart et al., *Medizin und Nationalsozialismus: Bilanz und Perspektiven der Forschung* (2nd edn. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2011)
- Kaelble, Hartmut, *Kalter Krieg und Wohlfahrtsstaat: Europa 1945–1989* (Munich: Beck, 2011)
- Kailer, Thomas, *Vermessung des Verbrechers: Die kriminalbiologische Untersuchung in Bayern, 1923–1945* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2011)
- Kaiser, Wolfram and Antonio Varsori (eds.), *European Union History: Themes and Debates* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)
- Kampmann, Christoph, Maximilian Lanzinner, et al. (eds.), *L'art de la paix: Kongresswesen und Friedensstiftung im Zeitalter des Westfälischen Friedens*, Schriftenreihe der Vereinigung zur Erforschung der Neueren Geschichte, 34 (Münster: Aschendorff, 2011)
- Kellner, Friedrich F., *'Vernebelt, verdunkelt sind alle Hirne': Tagebücher 1939–1945*, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Wallstein, 2011)
- Kemper, Claudia, *Das 'Gewissen' 1919–1925: Kommunikation und Vernetzung der Jungkonservativen*, Ordnungssysteme, 36 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)

- Kershaw, Ian, *The End: Hitler's Germany, 1944–45* (London: Allen Lane, 2011)
- Kießling, Friedrich and Bernhard Rieger (eds.), *Mit dem Wandel leben: Neuorientierung und Tradition in der Bundesrepublik der 1950er und 60er Jahre* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2011)
- Kintzinger, Martin and Bernd Schneidmüller (eds.), *Politische Öffentlichkeit im Spätmittelalter*, Vorträge und Forschungen/Konstanzer Arbeitskreis für mittelalterliche Geschichte, 75 (Ostfildern: Thorbecke, 2011)
- Kirchinger, Johann, *Michael Horlacher: Ein Agrarfunktionär in der Weimarer Republik*, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Parlamentarismus und der politischen Parteien, 159 (Düsseldorf: Droste, 2011)
- Kittel, Manfred, *Marsch durch die Institutionen? Politik und Kultur in Frankfurt nach 1968*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 86 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Klatt, Johanna and Robert Lorenz (eds.), *Manifeste: Geschichte und Gegenwart des politischen Appells*, Studien des Göttinger Instituts für Demokratieforschung zur Geschichte politischer und gesellschaftlicher Kontroversen, 1 (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2011)
- Kocka, Jürgen, *Arbeiten an der Geschichte: Gesellschaftlicher Wandel im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert*, Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft, 200 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Köhler, Matthias, *Strategie und Symbolik: Verhandeln auf dem Kongress von Nimwegen*, Externa, 3 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2011)
- Kraft, Claudia, Alf Lüdtke, and Jürgen Martschukat (eds.), *Kolonialgeschichten: Regionale Perspektiven auf ein globales Phänomen* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2010)
- Krohn, Claus-Dieter and Lutz Winckler (eds.), *Bibliotheken und Sammlungen im Exil*, Exilforschung, 29 (Munich: edition text + kritik, 2011)
- Krüssmann, Walter, *Ernst von Mansfeld (1580–1626): Grafensohn, Söldnerführer, Kriegsunternehmer gegen Habsburg im Dreißigjährigen Krieg*, Historische Forschungen, 94 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2010)
- Kubrova, Monika, *Vom guten Leben: Adelige Frauen im 19. Jahrhundert, Elitenwandel in der Moderne*, 12 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011)

## Library News

- Kühn, Sebastian, *Wissen, Arbeit, Freundschaft: Ökonomien und soziale Beziehungen an den Akademien in London, Paris und Berlin um 1700*, Berliner Mittelalter- und Frühneuzeitforschung, 10 (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2011)
- Kühne, Thomas, *Belonging and Genocide: Hitler's Community, 1918–1945* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010)
- Kuß, Susanne, *Deutsches Militär auf kolonialen Kriegsschauplätzen: Eskalation von Gewalt zu Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Studien zur Kolonialgeschichte, 3 (2nd edn. Berlin: Links, 2011)
- Laak, Dirk van (ed.), *Literatur, die Geschichte schrieb* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Lappenküper, Ulrich, *Mitterrand und Deutschland: Die enträtselte Sphinx*, Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 89 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Lee, Russell E., *Only the Wing: Reimar Horten's Epic Quest to Stabilize and Control the All-Wing Aircraft* (Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Scholarly Press, 2011)
- Lehner, Ulrich L., *Enlightened Monks: The German Benedictines 1740–1803* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Lemke, Michael, *Vor der Mauer: Berlin in der Ost-West-Konkurrenz 1948 bis 1961*, Zeithistorische Studien, 48 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2011)
- Leonhard, Jörn and Christian Wieland (eds.), *What Makes the Nobility Noble? Comparative Perspectives from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Century*, Schriftenreihe der Frias School of History, 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Lippert, Werner D., *The Economic Diplomacy of Ostpolitik: Origins of NATO's Energy Dilemma* (New York: Berghahn, 2011)
- Lipphardt, Anna, *Vilne: Die Juden aus Vilnius nach dem Holocaust. Eine transnationale Beziehungsgeschichte*, Studien zur historischen Migrationsforschung, 20 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2010)
- Lipstadt, Deborah E., *The Eichmann Trial, Jewish Encounters* (New York: Nextbook/Schocken, 2011)
- Livi, Massimiliano, Daniel Schmidt, and Michael Sturm (eds.), *Die 1970er Jahre als schwarzes Jahrzehnt: Politisierung und Mobilisierung zwischen christlicher Demokratie und extremer Rechter* (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 2010)
- Longerich, Peter, *Heinrich Himmler* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

- Louthan, Howard, Gary B. Cohen, and Franz A. J. Szabo (eds.), *Diversity and Dissent: Negotiating Religious Difference in Central Europe, 1500–1800*, Austrian and Habsburg Studies, 11 (New York: Bergahn Books, 2011)
- Ludwig I. König von Bayern, *Korrespondenzen König Ludwigs I. von Bayern*, pt. 3: *Nach dem Thronverzicht König Ludwigs I.*, ed. Hannelore Putz et al., 3 vols. (Munich: Komm. für bayerische Landesgeschichte, 2011)
- Markovits, Inga, *Justice in Lüritz: Experiencing Socialist Law in East Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010)
- Marks, Shula, Paul Weindling, and Laura Wintour (eds.), *In Defence of Learning: The Plight, Persecution, and Placement of Academic Refugees, 1933–1980s*, Proceedings of the British Academy, 169 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Meinel, Florian, *Der Jurist in der industriellen Gesellschaft: Ernst Forsthoff und seine Zeit* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011)
- Merziger, Patrick, Rudolf Stöber, et al. (eds.), *Geschichte, Öffentlichkeit, Kommunikation: Festschrift für Bernd Sösemann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2010)
- Mielke, Siegfried and Peter Rütters (eds.), *Der Freie Deutsche Gewerkschaftsbund 1945–1949/50: Gründung, Organisationsaufbau und Politik. Zonenebene*, Quellen zur Geschichte der deutschen Gewerkschaftsbewegung im 20. Jahrhundert, 15 (Bonn: Dietz, 2011)
- Mikhman, Dan, *The Emergence of Jewish Ghettos during the Holocaust*, trans. Lenn J. Schramm (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Mitchell, Allan, *The Devil's Captain: Ernst Jünger in Nazi Paris, 1941–1944* (New York: Bergahn Books, 2011)
- Mitterauer, Michael, *Why Europe: The Medieval Origins of its Special Path*, trans. Gerald Chapple (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010)
- Mölich, Georg, Veit Veltzke, and Bernd Walter (eds.), *Rheinland, Westfalen und Preußen: Eine Beziehungsgeschichte* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2011)
- Moll, Christiane (ed.) *Gesammelte Briefe: Alexander Schmorell, Christoph Probst*, Schriftenreihe der Gedenkstätte Deutscher Widerstand. Reihe B: Quellen und Berichte, 3 (Berlin: Lukas, 2011)

## Library News

- Mommsen, Hans, *Zur Geschichte Deutschlands im 20. Jahrhundert: Demokratie, Diktatur, Widerstand* (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2010)
- Moran, Joe, *On Roads: A Hidden History* (London: Profile Books, 2010)
- Müller, Armin, *Kienzle: Ein deutsches Industrieunternehmen im 20. Jahrhundert*, foreword by Thomas Guzatis and afterword by Christian H. Kienzle, *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 2 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011)
- Müller, Christian T., *US-Truppen und Sowjetarmee in Deutschland: Erfahrungen, Beziehungen, Konflikte im Vergleich*, *Krieg in der Geschichte*, 70 (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2011)
- Müller, Dirk H., *Adliges Eigentumsrecht und Landesverfassung: Die Auseinandersetzungen um die eigentumsrechtlichen Privilegien des Adels im 18. und 19. Jahrhundert am Beispiel Brandenburgs und Pommerns*, *Elitenwandel in der Moderne*, 11 (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2011)
- Müller, Frank Lorenz, *Our Fritz: Emperor Frederick III and the Political Culture of Imperial Germany* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011)
- Müller, Jan-Werner, *Contesting Democracy: Political Ideas in Twentieth Century Europe* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2011)
- Müller, Rolf-Dieter, *Der Feind steht im Osten: Hitlers geheime Pläne für einen Krieg gegen die Sowjetunion im Jahr 1939* (Berlin: Links, 2011)
- Neiberg, Michael S., *Dance of the Furies: Europe and the Outbreak of World War I* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011)
- Neitzel, Sönke and Harald Welzer, *Soldaten: Protokolle vom Kämpfen, Töten und Sterben* (3rd edn. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 2011)
- Nelson, Robert L., *German Soldier Newspapers of the First World War*, *Studies in the Social and Cultural History of Modern Warfare*, 33 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Neuhaus, Helmut (ed.), *Verfassungsänderungen: Tagung der Vereinigung für Verfassungsgeschichte in Hofgeismar vom 15. bis 17. März 2010*, *Der Staat*, Beiheft 20 (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, 2011)
- Neuner, Stephanie, *Politik und Psychiatrie: Die staatliche Versorgung psychisch Kriegsbeschädigter in Deutschland 1920–1939*, *Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft*, 197 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)



- Niederhut, Jens and Uwe Zuber (eds.), *Geheimsschutz transparent? Verschlussachen in staatlichen Archiven*, Veröffentlichungen des Landesarchivs Nordrhein-Westfalen, 34 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2010)
- Niggemann, Ulrich and Kai Ruffing (eds.), *Antike als Modell in Nordamerika? Konstruktion und Verargumentierung 1763–1809*, Historische Zeitschrift, NS Beiheft 55 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Niven, William John (ed.), *Die Wilhelm Gustloff: Geschichte und Erinnerung eines Untergangs* (Halle: Mitteldeutscher Verlag, 2011)
- Oexle, Otto Gerhard, *Die Wirklichkeit und das Wissen: Mittelalterforschung, Historische Kulturwissenschaft, Geschichte und Theorie der historischen Erkenntnis*, ed. Andrea von Hülsen-Esch, Bernhard Jussen, and Frank Rexroth (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Ogborn, Miles and Charles W. J. Withers (eds.), *Geographies of the Book* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010)
- Ogilvie, Sheilagh C., *Institutions and European Trade: Merchant Guilds, 1000–1800*, Cambridge Studies in Economic History, 2nd series (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Osterloh, Jörg and Clemens Vollnhals (eds.), *NS-Prozesse und deutsche Öffentlichkeit: Besatzungszeit, frühe Bundesrepublik und DDR*, Schriften des Hannah-Arendt-Instituts für Totalitarismusforschung, 45 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Paravicini, Werner (ed.), *Deutsch-Französische Geschichte*, x. Corine Defrance and Ulrich Pfeil, *Eine Nachkriegsgeschichte in Europa 1945 bis 1963*; xi. Hélène Miard-Delacroix, *Im Zeichen der europäischen Einigung 1963 bis in die Gegenwart* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2011)
- Paul, Gerhard (ed.), *Bilder, die Geschichte schrieben: 1900 bis heute* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Pawliczek, Aleksandra, *Akademischer Alltag zwischen Ausgrenzung und Erfolg: Jüdische Dozenten an der Berliner Universität 1871–1933*, Pallas Athene, 38 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011)
- Pernau, Margrit, *Transnationale Geschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Peters, Jan, *Menschen und Möglichkeiten: Ein Historikerleben in der DDR und anderen Traumländern*, Pallas Athene, 36 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011)

## Library News

- Pons, Silvio and Robert Service (eds.), *A Dictionary of Twentieth-Century Communism*, trans. Mark Epstein and Charles Townsend (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010)
- Porciani, Ilaria and Lutz Raphael (eds.), *Atlas of European Historiography: The Making of a Profession, 1800–2005, Writing the Nation* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010)
- Price, David H., *Johannes Reuchlin and the Campaign to Destroy Jewish Books* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Raillard, Susanne, *Die See- und Küstenfischerei Mecklenburgs und Vorpommerns 1918 bis 1960: Traditionelles Gewerbe unter ökonomischem und politischem Wandlungsdruck*, Veröffentlichungen zur SBZ-/DDR-Forschung im Institut für Zeitgeschichte; Quellen und Darstellungen zur Zeitgeschichte, 87 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2012)
- Raphael, Lutz, *Imperiale Gewalt und mobilisierte Nation: Europa 1914–1945* (Munich: Beck, 2011)
- Reichel, Thomas, *‘Sozialistisch arbeiten, lernen und leben’: Die Brigadebewegung in der DDR (1959–1989)* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2011)
- Ribhegge, Wilhelm, *Erasmus von Rotterdam*, Gestalten der Neuzeit (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2010)
- Richter, Saskia, *Die Aktivistin: Das Leben der Petra Kelly* (Munich: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 2010)
- Ritchie, Donald A. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Oral History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Robrecht, Antje, *‘Diplomaten in Hemdsärmeln’? Auslandskorrespondenten als Akteure in den deutsch-britischen Beziehungen, 1945–1962*, Beiträge zur England-Forschung, 63 (Augsburg: Wißner, 2010)
- Rogge, Jörg (ed.), *Cultural History in Europe: Institutions, Themes, Perspectives*, Mainzer Historische Kulturwissenschaften, 5 (Bielefeld: transcript, 2011)
- Rublack, Ulinka (ed.), *A Concise Companion to History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Rudolph, Harriet, *Das Reich als Ereignis: Formen und Funktionen der Herrschaftsinszenierung bei Kaisereinzügen (1558–1618)*, Norm und Struktur, 38 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2011)
- Sarkowicz, Hans and Alf Mentzer, *Schriftsteller im Nationalsozialismus: Ein Lexikon* (Berlin: Insel Verlag, 2011)
- Schafranek, Hans, *Söldner für den ‘Anschluss’: Die Österreichische Legion 1933–1938* (Vienna: Czernin, 2011)

- Schirmer, Gisela, *Willi Sitte-Lidice: Historienbild und Kunstpolitik in der DDR* (Berlin: Reimer, 2011)
- Schlegelmilch, Anna Margarete, *Die Jugendjahre Karls V.: Lebenswelt und Erziehung des burgundischen Prinzen*, Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, Beiheft 67 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2011)
- Schlenker, Ines and Kristian Wachinger (eds.), *Liebhaber ohne Adresse: Briefwechsel 1942–1992. Elias Canetti und Marie-Louise von Motesiczky* (Munich: Hanser, 2011)
- Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger (ed.), *Wählen in Deutschland*, Politische Vierteljahresschrift, Sonderheft 45 (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2012)
- Schmoll-Eisenwerth, Reineke (ed.), 'Historiographie als literarische Veranstaltung': *Festschrift zum 80. Geburtstag von Helmut Berding* (Bonn: Dietz, 2010)
- Schneidmüller, Bernd, *Grenzerfahrung und monarchische Ordnung: Europa 1200–1500* (Munich: Beck, 2011)
- Scholyseck, Joachim, *Die Geschichte der National-Bank* (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011)
- Schwerhoff, Gerd (ed.), *Stadt und Öffentlichkeit in der Frühen Neuzeit*, Städteforschung. Reihe A: Darstellungen, 83 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2011)
- Sellin, Volker, *Gewalt und Legitimität: Die europäische Monarchie im Zeitalter der Revolutionen* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Selzer, Stephan, *Die mittelalterliche Hanse* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2010)
- Simms, Brendan and David J. B. Trim (eds.), *Humanitarian Intervention: A History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Skor, Holger, 'Brücken über den Rhein': *Frankreich in der Wahrnehmung und Propaganda des Dritten Reiches, 1933–1939*, Schriften der Bibliothek für Zeitgeschichte, NS 26 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2011)
- Smith, Helmut Walser (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Modern German History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011)
- Sösemann, Bernd, *Propaganda: Medien und Öffentlichkeit in der NS-Diktatur*, Beiträge zur Kommunikationsgeschichte, 25, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011)
- Sondhaus, Lawrence, *World War I: The Global Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Sonntag, Marcus, *Die Arbeitslager in der DDR* (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2011)

## Library News

- Stein, Mathias, *Der Konflikt um Alleinvertretung und Anerkennung in der UNO: Die deutsch-deutschen Beziehungen zu den Vereinten Nationen von 1949 bis 1973* (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2011)
- Stevenson, David, *With our Backs to the Wall: Victory and Defeat in 1918* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2011)
- Stöcker, Georg, *Agrarideologie und Sozialreform im Deutschen Kaiserreich: Heinrich Sohnrey und der Deutsche Verein für ländliche Wohlfahrts- und Heimatpflege 1896–1914* (Göttingen: V & R unipress, 2011)
- Stoklosa, Katarzyna, *Polen und die deutsche Ostpolitik 1945–1990* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Stott, Rosemary, *Crossing the Wall: The Western Feature Film Import in East Germany*, *New Studies in European Cinema*, 11 (Oxford: Lang, 2012)
- Strnad, Maximilian, *Zwischenstation 'Jüdensiedlung': Verfolgung und Deportation der jüdischen Münchner 1941–1945*, *Studien zur jüdischen Geschichte und Kultur in Bayern*, 4 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Torp, Claudius, *Konsum und Politik in der Weimarer Republik*, *Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft*, 196 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011)
- Trevor-Roper, Hugh, *The Wartime Journals*, ed. Richard Davenport-Hines (London: Tauris, 2012)
- Trutkowski, Dominik, *Der geteilte Ostblock: Die Grenzen der SBZ/DDR zu Polen und der Tschechoslowakei*, *Zeithistorische Studien*, 49 (Cologne: Böhlau, 2011)
- Turner-Graham, Emily and Christine Winter (eds.), *National Socialism in Oceania: A Critical Evaluation of its Effect and Aftermath*, *Germanica Pacifica*, 4 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2010)
- Turner-Graham, Emily, *'Never forget that you are a German': Die Brücke, Deutschtum and National Socialism in Interwar Australia*, *Germanica Pacifica*, 6 (Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2011)
- Ueberschär, Gerd R. (ed.), *Hitlers militärische Elite: 68 Lebensläufe* (2nd rev. edn. Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2011)
- Uerlings, Herbert, Nina Trauth, und Lukas Clemens (eds.), *Armut: Perspektiven in Kunst und Gesellschaft. 10.4.2011–31.7.2011. Eine Ausstellung des Sonderforschungsbereichs 600 'Fremdheit und Armut', Universität Trier in Kooperation mit dem Stadtmuseum Simeonstift*

- Trier und dem Rheinischen Landesmuseum Trier*, exhibition catalogue (Darmstadt: Primus Verlag, 2011)
- Ullrich, Christina, *'Ich fühl' mich nicht als Mörder'*: Die Integration von NS-Tätern in die Nachkriegsgesellschaft, Veröffentlichungen der Forschungsstelle Ludwigsburg der Universität Stuttgart, 18 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2011)
- Volkman, Hans-Erich, *Luxemburg im Zeichen des Hakenkreuzes: Eine politische Wirtschaftsgeschichte 1933 bis 1944*, Zeitalter der Weltkriege (2nd rev. edn. Paderborn: Schöningh, 2011)
- Walther, Stefanie, *Die (Un-)Ordnung der Ehe: Normen und Praxis ernestinischer Fürstenehen in der frühen Neuzeit*, Ancien Régime, Aufklärung und Revolution, 39 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Wedel, Gudrun, *Autobiographien von Frauen: Ein Lexikon* (Cologne: Böhlau, 2010)
- Wefing, Heinrich, *Der Fall Demjanjuk: Der letzte große NS-Prozess* (Munich: Beck, 2011)
- Wehrmann, Hildegard, *Hermann Pünder (1888–1976): Patriot und Europäer*, Düsseldorfer Schriften zur neueren Landesgeschichte und zur Geschichte Nordrhein-Westfalens, 85 (Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2012)
- Welzer, Harald, Sönke Neitzel, and Christian Gudehus (eds.), *'Der Führer war wieder viel zu human, viel zu gefühlvoll': Der Zweite Weltkrieg aus der Sicht deutscher und italienischer Soldaten*, Die Zeit des Nationalsozialismus (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 2011)
- Wengst, Udo (ed.), *Reform und Revolte: Politischer und gesellschaftlicher Wandel in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland vor und nach 1968*, Zeitgeschichte im Gespräch, 12 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Wenzke, Rüdiger, *Ab nach Schwedt! Die Geschichte des DDR-Militärstrafvollzugs* (Berlin: Links, 2011)
- Werner, Michael, *Stiftungsstadt und Bürgertum: Hamburgs Stiftingskultur vom Kaiserreich bis in den Nationalsozialismus*, Stadt und Bürgertum, 14 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Westermann, Ekkehard and Markus A. Denzel, *Das Kaufmannsnotizbuch des Matthäus Schwarz aus Augsburg von 1548*, Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, Beiheft 215 (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2011)
- Whaley, Joachim, *Germany and the Holy Roman Empire*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012)

Library News

- Wiede, Wiebke, *Rasse im Buch: Antisemitische und rassistische Publikationen in Verlagsprogrammen der Weimarer Republik*, *Ordnungssysteme*, 34 (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Wilson, Peter H., *The Holy Roman Empire 1495–1806*, *Studies in European History* (2nd edn. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011)
- Wüst, Wolfgang, *Die 'gute' Policey im Reichskreis, v. Policeyordnungen in den Markgraftümern Ansbach und Kulmbach-Bayreuth* (Erlangen: Wi-Komm-Verlag, 2011)
- Zehnpfennig, Barbara, *Adolf Hitler: Mein Kampf. Weltanschauung und Programm*, *Studienkommentar, Politische Philosophie, Geschichte* (Munich: Fink, 2011)
- Zmora, Hilla, *The Feud in Early Modern Germany* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011)
- Zollmann, Jakob, *Koloniale Herrschaft und ihre Grenzen: Die Kolonialpolizei in Deutsch-Südwestafrika 1894–1915*, *Kritische Studien zur Geschichtswissenschaft*, 191 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010)

## PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Vol. 1: Wilhelm Lenz (ed.), *Archivalische Quellen zur deutsch-britischen Geschichte seit 1500 in Großbritannien; Manuscript Sources for the History of Germany since 1500 in Great Britain* (Boppard a. Rh.: Boldt, 1975)

Vol. 2: Lothar Kettenacker (ed.), *Das 'Andere Deutschland' im Zweiten Weltkrieg: Emigration und Widerstand in internationaler Perspektive; The 'Other Germany' in the Second World War: Emigration and Resistance in International Perspective* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1977)

Vol. 3: Marie-Luise Recker, *England und der Donauraum, 1919–1929: Probleme einer europäischen Nachkriegsordnung* (Stuttgart: Klett, 1976)

Vol. 4: Paul Kluge and Peter Alter (eds.), *Aspekte der deutsch-britischen Beziehungen im Laufe der Jahrhunderte; Aspects of Anglo-German Relations through the Centuries* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978)

Vol. 5: Wolfgang J. Mommsen, Peter Alter, and Robert W. Scribner (eds.), *Stadtbürgertum und Adel in der Reformation: Studien zur Sozialgeschichte der Reformation in England und Deutschland; The Urban Classes, the Nobility and the Reformation: Studies on the Social History of the Reformation in England and Germany* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1979)

Vol. 6: Hans-Christoph Junge, *Flottenpolitik und Revolution: Die Entstehung der englischen Seemacht während der Herrschaft Cromwells* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1980)

Vol. 7: Milan Hauner, *India in Axis Strategy: Germany, Japan, and Indian Nationalists in the Second World War* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)

Vol. 8: Gerhard Hirschfeld and Lothar Kettenacker (eds.), *Der 'Führerstaat': Mythos und Realität. Studien zur Struktur und Politik des Dritten Reiches; The 'Führer State': Myth and Reality. Studies on the Structure and Politics of the Third Reich* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)

Vol. 9: Hans-Eberhard Hilpert, *Kaiser- und Papstbriefe in den Chronica majora des Matthaeus Paris* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1981)

Vol. 10: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds.), *Sozialprotest, Gewalt, Terror: Gewaltanwendung durch politische and gesellschaftliche Randgruppen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 11: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds.), *Die Entstehung des Wohlfahrtsstaates in Großbritannien und Deutschland 1850–1950* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 12: Peter Alter, *Wissenschaft, Staat, Mäzene: Anfänge moderner Wissenschaftspolitik in Großbritannien 1850–1920* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 13: Wolfgang Mock, *Imperiale Herrschaft und nationales Interesse: 'Constructive Imperialism' oder Freihandel in Großbritannien vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 14: Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *Exil in Großbritannien: Zur Emigration aus dem nationalsozialistischen Deutschland* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1982)

Vol. 15: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung (eds.), *Auf dem Wege zur Massengewerkschaft: Die Entwicklung der Gewerkschaften in Deutschland und Großbritannien 1880–1914* (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1984)

Vol. 16: Josef Foschepoth (ed.), *Kalter Krieg und Deutsche Frage: Deutschland im Widerstreit der Mächte 1945–1952* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985)

Vol. 17: Ulrich Wengenroth, *Unternehmensstrategien und technischer Fortschritt: Die deutsche und britische Stahlindustrie 1865–1895* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)

Vol. 18: Helmut Reifeld, *Zwischen Empire und Parlament: Zur Gedankenbildung und Politik Lord Roseberys (1880–1905)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987)

Vol. 19: Michael Maurer, *Aufklärung und Anglophilie in Deutschland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987)

Vol. 20: Karl Heinz Metz, *Industrialisierung und Sozialpolitik: Das Problem der sozialen Sicherheit in Großbritannien 1795–1911* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988)

Vol. 21: Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Schwentker (eds.), *Max Weber und seine Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1988)

Vol. 22: Lothar Kettenacker, *Krieg zur Friedenssicherung: Die Deutschlandplanung der britischen Regierung während des Zweiten Weltkrieges* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)



Vol. 23: Adolf M. Birke and Günther Heydemann (eds.), *Die Herausforderung des europäischen Staatensystems: Nationale Ideologie und staatliches Interesse zwischen Restauration und Imperialismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989)

Vol. 24: Helga Woggon, *Integrativer Sozialismus und nationale Befreiung: Politik und Wirkungsgeschichte James Connollys in Irland* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 25: Kaspar von Greyerz, *Vorsehungsglaube und Kosmologie: Studien zu englischen Selbstzeugnissen des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 26: Andreas Wirsching, *Parlament und Volkes Stimme: Unterhaus und Öffentlichkeit im England des frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990)

Vol. 27: Claudia Schnurmann, *Kommerz und Klüngel: Der Englandhandel Kölner Kaufleute im 16. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)

Vol. 28: Anselm Doering-Manteuffel, *Vom Wiener Kongreß zur Pariser Konferenz: England, die deutsche Frage und das Mächtesystem 1815–1856* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991)

Vol. 29: Peter Alter (ed.), *Im Banne der Metropolen: Berlin und London in den zwanziger Jahren* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 30: Hermann Wentker, *Zerstörung der Großmacht Rußland? Die britischen Kriegsziele im Krimkrieg* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 31: Angela Schwarz, *Die Reise ins Dritte Reich: Britische Augenzeugen im nationalsozialistischen Deutschland (1933–1939)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 32: Johannes Paulmann, *Staat und Arbeitsmarkt in Großbritannien: Krise, Weltkrieg, Wiederaufbau* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 33: Clemens Picht, *Handel, Politik und Gesellschaft: Zur wirtschaftspolitischen Publizistik Englands im 18. Jahrhundert* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Vol. 34: Friedrich Weckerlein, *Streitfall Deutschland: Die britische Linke und die 'Demokratisierung' des Deutschen Reiches, 1900–1918* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994)

Vol. 35: Klaus Larres, *Politik der Illusionen: Churchill, Eisenhower und die deutsche Frage 1945–1955* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 36: Günther Heydemann, *Konstitution gegen Revolution: Die britische Deutschland- und Italienpolitik 1815–1848* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 37: Hermann Joseph Hiery, *Das Deutsche Reich in der Südsee (1900–1921): Eine Annäherung an die Erfahrungen verschiedener Kulturen* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995)

Vol. 38: Michael Toyka-Seid, *Gesundheit und Krankheit in der Stadt: Zur Entwicklung des Gesundheitswesens in Durham City 1831–1914* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996)

Vol. 39: Detlev Clemens, *Herr Hitler in Germany: Wahrnehmung und Deutung des Nationalsozialismus in Großbritannien 1920 bis 1939* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996)

Vol. 40: Christel Gade, *Gleichgewichtspolitik oder Bündnispflege? Maximen britischer Außenpolitik (1910–1914)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)

Vol. 41: Benedikt Stuchtey, *W. E. H. Lecky (1838–1903): Historisches Denken und politisches Urteilen eines anglo-irischen Gelehrten* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997)

Vol. 42: Sabine Sundermann, *Deutscher Nationalismus im englischen Exil: Zum sozialen und politischen Innenleben der deutschen Kolonie in London 1848 bis 1871* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997)

Vol. 43: Knut Diekmann, *Die nationalistische Bewegung in Wales* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1998)

Vol. 44: Bärbel Brodt, *Städte ohne Mauern: Stadtentwicklung in East Anglia im 14. Jahrhundert* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1997)

Vol. 45: Arnd Reitemeier, *Außenpolitik im Spätmittelalter: Die diplomatischen Beziehungen zwischen dem Reich und England 1377* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1999)

Vol. 46: Gerhard A. Ritter and Peter Wende (eds.), *Rivalität und Partnerschaft: Studien zu den deutsch-britischen Beziehungen im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. Festschrift für Anthony J. Nicholls* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1999)

Vol. 47: Ulrich Marsch, *Zwischen Wissenschaft und Wirtschaft: Industrieforschung in Deutschland und Großbritannien 1880–1936* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2000)

Vol. 48: Lothar Reinermann, *Der Kaiser in England: Wilhelm II. und die britische Öffentlichkeit* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001)

Vol. 49: Josef Reindl, *Wachstum und Wettbewerb in den Wirtschaftswunderjahren: Die elektrotechnische Industrie in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Großbritannien 1945–1967* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001)

Vol. 50: Jörn Leonhard, *Liberalismus: Zur historischen Semantik eines europäischen Deutungsmusters* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2001)

Vol. 51: Willibald Steinmetz, *Begegnungen vor Gericht: Eine Sozial- und Kulturgeschichte des englischen Arbeitsrechts (1850–1925)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2002)

Vol. 52: Andreas Rödder, *Die radikale Herausforderung: Die politische Kultur der englischen Konservativen zwischen ländlicher Tradition und industrieller Moderne (1846–1868)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2002)

Vol. 53: Dominik Geppert, *Thatchers konservative Revolution: Der Richtungswandel der britischen Tories (1975–1979)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2002)

Vol. 54: Nikolaus Braun, *Terrorismus und Freiheitskampf: Gewalt, Propaganda und politische Strategie im Irischen Bürgerkrieg 1922/23* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003)

Vol. 55: Andreas Fahrmeir, *Ehrbare Spekulanten: Stadtverfassung, Wirtschaft und Politik in der City of London, 1688–1900* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2003)

Vol. 56: Christoph Heyl, *A Passion for Privacy: Untersuchungen zur Genese der bürgerlichen Privatsphäre in London, 1660–1800* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004)

Vol. 57: Ulrike Lindner, *Gesundheitspolitik in der Nachkriegszeit: Großbritannien und die Bundesrepublik Deutschland im Vergleich* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2004)

- Vol. 58: Ursula Rombeck-Jaschinski, *Das Londoner Schuldenabkommen: Die Regelung der deutschen Auslandsschulden nach dem Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)
- Vol. 59: Thomas Wittek, *Auf ewig Feind? Das Deutschlandbild in den britischen Massenmedien nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)
- Vol. 60: Hans-Christof Kraus, *Englische Verfassung und politisches Denken im Ancien Régime: 1689 bis 1789* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)
- Vol. 61: Margrit Schulte Beerbühl, *Deutsche Kaufleute in London: Welthandel und Einbürgerung (1660–1818)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2006)
- Vol. 62: Florian Altenhöner, *Kommunikation und Kontrolle: Gerüchte und städtische Öffentlichkeiten in Berlin und London 1914/1918* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Vol. 63: Renate Held, *Deutsche als Kriegsgefangene in Großbritannien im Zweiten Weltkrieg* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2008)
- Vol. 64: Dominik Geppert, *Pressekriege: Öffentlichkeit und Diplomatie in den deutsch-britischen Beziehungen (1896–1912)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2007)
- Vol. 65: Frank Bösch, *Öffentliche Geheimnisse: Skandale, Politik und Medien in Deutschland und Großbritannien, 1880–1914* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Vol. 66: Fabian Klose, *Menschenrechte im Schatten kolonialer Gewalt: Die Dekolonisierungskriege in Kenia und Algerien, 1945–1962* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Vol. 67: Almut Steinbach, *Sprachpolitik im Britischen Empire: Herrschaftssprache und Integration in Ceylon und den Föderierten Malaiischen Staaten* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2009)
- Vol. 68: Christiane Reinecke, *Grenzen der Freizügigkeit: Migrationskontrolle in Großbritannien und Deutschland, 1880–1930* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2010)
- Vol. 69: Andreas Pečar, *Macht der Schrift: Politischer Biblizismus in Schottland zwischen Reformation und Bürgerkrieg (1534–1642)* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)
- Vol. 70: Andreas Rose, *Zwischen Empire und Kontinent: Britische Außenpolitik vor dem Ersten Weltkrieg* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2011)

STUDIES OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE  
LONDON – OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Eckhart Hellmuth (ed.), *The Transformation of Political Culture: England and Germany in the Late Eighteenth Century* (Oxford, 1990)

Ronald G. Asch and Adolf M. Birke (eds.), *Princes, Patronage, and the Nobility: The Court at the Beginning of the Modern Age c.1450–1650* (Oxford, 1991)

Rolf Ahmann, Adolf M. Birke, and Michael Howard (eds.), *The Quest for Stability: Problems of West European Security 1918–1957* (Oxford, 1993)

Alfred Haverkamp and Hanna Vollrath (eds.), *England and Germany in the High Middle Ages* (Oxford, 1996)

John Brewer and Eckhart Hellmuth (eds.), *Rethinking Leviathan: The Eighteenth-Century State in Britain and Germany* (Oxford, 1999)

Benedikt Stuchtey and Peter Wende (eds.), *British and German Historiography 1750–1950: Traditions, Perceptions, and Transfers* (Oxford, 2000)

Willibald Steinmetz (ed.), *Private Law and Social Inequality in the Industrial Age: Comparing Legal Cultures in Britain, France, Germany, and the United States* (Oxford, 2000)

Martin H. Geyer and Johannes Paulmann (eds.), *The Mechanics of Internationalism: Culture, Society, and Politics from the 1840s to the First World War* (Oxford, 2001)

Jeremy Noakes, Peter Wende, and Jonathan Wright (eds.), *Britain and Germany in Europe 1949–1990* (Oxford, 2002)

Benedikt Stuchtey and Eckhardt Fuchs (eds.), *Writing World History 1800–2000* (Oxford, 2003)

Dominik Geppert (ed.), *The Postwar Challenge: Cultural, Social, and Political Change in Western Europe, 1945–1958* (Oxford, 2003)

Benedikt Stuchtey (ed.), *Science across the European Empires, 1800–1950* (Oxford, 2005)

Michael Schaich (ed.), *Monarchy and Religion: The Transformation of Royal Culture in Eighteenth-Century Europe* (Oxford, 2007)

Matthias Reiss (ed.), *The Street as Stage: Protest Marches and Public Rallies since the Nineteenth Century* (Oxford, 2007)

Karina Urbach (ed.), *European Aristocracies and the Radical Right 1918–1939* (Oxford, 2007)

Markus Mösslang and Torsten Riotte (eds.), *The Diplomats' World: A Cultural History of Diplomacy, 1815–1914* (Oxford, 2008)

Dominik Geppert and Robert Gerwarth (eds.), *Wilhelmine Germany and Edwardian Britain: Essays on Cultural Affinity* (Oxford, 2008)

Richard Bessel and Claudia B. Haake (eds.), *Removing Peoples: Forced Removal in the Modern World* (Oxford, 2009; paperback 2011)

Matthias Reiss and Matt Perry (eds.), *Unemployment and Protest: New Perspectives on Two Centuries of Contention* (Oxford, 2011)

R. J. W. Evans, Michael Schaich, and Peter H. Wilson (eds.), *The Holy Roman Empire, 1495–1806* (Oxford, 2011)

Kerstin Brückweh (ed.), *The Voice of the Citizen Consumer: A History of Market Research, Consumer Movements, and the Political Public Sphere* (Oxford, 2011)

Willibald Steinmetz (ed.), *Political Languages in the Age of Extremes* (Oxford, 2011)

## FURTHER PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Wolfgang Mock (eds.), *The Emergence of the Welfare State in Britain and Germany* (London: Croom Helm, 1981)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Gerhard Hirschfeld (eds.), *Social Protest, Violence and Terror in Nineteenth- and Twentieth-Century Europe* (London: Macmillan, 1982)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Lothar Kettenacker (eds.), *The Fascist Challenge and the Policy of Appeasement* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1983)

Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *Exile in Great Britain: Refugees from Hitler's Germany* (Leamington Spa: Berg Publishers, 1984)

Kaspar von Greyerz (ed.), *Religion, Politics and Social Protest: Three Studies on Early Modern Germany* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1984)

Kaspar von Greyerz (ed.), *Religion and Society in Early Modern Europe 1500–1800* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985)

Josef Foschepoth and Rolf Steininger (eds.), *Die britische Deutschland- und Besatzungspolitik 1945–1949* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 1985)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Hans-Gerhard Husung (eds.), *The Development of Trade Unionism in Great Britain and Germany, 1880–1914* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1985)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds.), *Imperialism and After: Continuities and Discontinuities* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986)

Gerhard Hirschfeld (ed.), *The Policies of Genocide: Jews and Soviet Prisoners of War in Nazi Germany* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1986)

Ralph Uhlig, *Die Deutsch-Englische Gesellschaft 1949–1983: Der Beitrag ihrer 'Königswinter-Konferenzen' zur britisch-deutschen Verständigung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986)

Wolfgang J. Mommsen and Jürgen Osterhammel (eds.), *Max Weber and his Contemporaries* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1987)

Peter Alter, *The Reluctant Patron: Science and the State in Britain 1850–1920* (Leamington Spa: Berg Publishers, 1987)

Stig Förster, Wolfgang J. Mommsen, and Ronald Robinson (eds.), *Bismarck, Europe, and Africa: The Berlin Africa Conference 1884–1885 and the Onset of Partition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988)

Adolf M. Birke, Hans Booms, and Otto Merker (eds.), *Control Commission for Germany/British Element: Inventory; Die britische Militärregierung in Deutschland: Inventar*, 11 vols (Munich: Saur Verlag, 1993)

Günther Heydemann and Lothar Kettenacker (eds.), *Kirchen in der Diktatur* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

Dagmar Engels and Shula Marks (eds.), *Contesting Colonial Hegemony: Africa and India 1858 to Independence* (London: British Academic Press, 1993)

Ulrike Jordan (ed.), *Conditions of Surrender: Britons and Germans Witness the End of the War* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1996)

Hermann Hiery and John M. MacKenzie (eds.), *European Impact and Pacific Influence: British and German Colonial Policy in the Pacific Islands and the Indigenous Response* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1997)

Peter Alter (ed.), *Out of the Third Reich: Refugee Historians in Post-War Britain* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1998)

Sabine Freitag (ed.), *Exiles from European Revolutions: Refugees in Mid-Victorian England* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2003)

Dominik Geppert and Udo Wengst (eds.), *Neutralität: Chance oder Chimäre? Konzepte des Dritten Weges für Deutschland und die Welt 1945–1990* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2005)

Werner Paravicini (ed.), *Luxus und Integration: Materielle Hofkultur Westeuropas vom 12. bis zum 18. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 2010)

Lothar Kettenacker and Torsten Rlotte (eds.), *The Legacies of Two World Wars: European Societies in the Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2011)

## BRITISH ENVOYS TO GERMANY

Sabine Freitag and Peter Wende (eds.), *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*, i. 1816–1829, Camden Fifth Series, 15 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society in association with the German Historical Institute London, 2000)

Markus Mösslang, Sabine Freitag, and Peter Wende (eds.), *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*, ii. 1830–1847, Camden Fifth Series, 21 (Cambridge:



Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society in association with the German Historical Institute London, 2002)

Markus Mösslang, Torsten Riotte, and Hagen Schulze (eds.), *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*, iii. 1848–1850, Camden Fifth Series, 28 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society in association with the German Historical Institute London, 2006)

Markus Mösslang, Chris Manias, and Torsten Riotte (eds.), *British Envoys to Germany, 1816–1866*, iv. 1851–1866, Camden Fifth Series, 37 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Historical Society in association with the German Historical Institute London, 2010)

#### HOUSE PUBLICATIONS OF THE GERMAN HISTORICAL INSTITUTE LONDON

Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Two Centuries of Anglo-German Relations: A Re-appraisal* (London, 1984)

Adolf M. Birke, *Britain and Germany: Historical Patterns of a Relationship* (London, 1987)

Gerhard A. Ritter, *The New Social History in the Federal Republic of Germany* (London, 1991)

Adolf M. Birke and Eva A. Mayring (eds.), *Britische Besatzung in Deutschland: Aktenschließung und Forschungsfelder* (London, 1992)

Gerhard A. Ritter, *Big Science in Germany: Past and Present* (London, 1994)

Adolf M. Birke, *Britain's Influence on the West German Constitution* (London, 1995)

Otto Gerhard Oexle, *The British Roots of the Max-Planck-Gesellschaft* (London, 1995)

### ***Research on British History***

Lothar Kettenacker and Wolfgang J. Mommsen (eds.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1978–1983* (London, 1983)

Frank Rexroth (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1983–1988: An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 1990)

Ulrike Jordan (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1989–1994: An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 1996)

Andreas Fahrmeir (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1995–1997: An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 1998)

Regina Pörtner (ed.), *Research on British History in the Federal Republic of Germany 1998–2000: An Annotated Bibliography* (London, 2002)

### ***Annual Lectures of the German Historical Institute London***

1979 Samuel Berrick Saul, *Industrialisation and De-Industrialisation? The Interaction of the German and British Economies before the First World War* (London, 1980)

1980 Karl Dietrich Erdmann, *Gustav Stresemann: The Revision of Versailles and the Weimar Parliamentary System* (London, 1981)

1981 A. J. P. Taylor, *1939 Revisited* (London, 1982)

1982 Gordon A. Craig, *Germany and the West: The Ambivalent Relationship* (London, 1983)

1983 Wolfram Fischer, *Germany in the World Economy during the Nineteenth Century* (London, 1984)

1984 James Joll, *National Histories and National Historians: Some German and English Views of the Past* (London, 1985)

1985 Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Britain and Germany 1800 to 1914: Two Developmental Paths Towards Industrial Society* (London, 1986)

1986 Owen Chadwick, *Acton, Döllinger and History* (London, 1987)

- 1987 Hagen Schulze, *Is there a German History?* (London, 1988)
- 1988 Roger Morgan, *Britain and Germany since 1945: Two Societies and Two Foreign Policies* (London, 1989)
- 1989 Thomas Nipperdey, *The Rise of the Arts in Modern Society* (London, 1990)
- 1990 *Not available*
- 1991 Lothar Gall, *Confronting Clio: Myth-Makers and Other Historians* (London, 1992)
- 1992 Keith Robbins, *Protestant Germany through British Eyes: A Complex Victorian Encounter* (London, 1993)
- 1993 Klaus Hildebrand, *Reich – Nation-State – Great Power: Reflections on German Foreign Policy 1871–1945* (London, 1995)
- 1994 Alan Bullock, *Personality and Power: The Strange Case of Hitler and Stalin* (London, 1995)
- 1995 Ernst Schulin, *'The Most Historical of All Peoples': Nationalism and the New Construction of Jewish History in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (London, 1996)
- 1996 Michael Howard, *The Crisis of the Anglo-German Antagonism 1916–17* (London, 1997)
- 1997 Johannes Fried, *The Veil of Memory: Anthropological Problems when Considering the Past* (London, 1998)
- 1998 David Blackbourn, *A Sense of Place: New Directions in German History* (London, 1999)
- 1999 Gerhard A. Ritter, *Continuity and Change: Political and Social Developments in Germany after 1945 and 1989/90* (London, 2000)
- 2000 Peter Pulzer, *Fog in Channel: Anglo-German Perceptions in the Nineteenth Century* (London, 2001)
- 2001 Heinrich A. Winkler, *The Long Shadow of the Reich: Weighing Up German History* (London, 2002)

- 2002 *Not available*
- 2003 Werner Paravicini, *Fact and Fiction: St Patrick's Purgatory and the European Chivalry in the Later Middle Ages* (London, 2004)
- 2004 Anthony J. Nicholls, *Always Good Neighbours – Never Good Friends? Anglo-German Relations 1949–2001* (London, 2005)
- 2005 Jürgen Osterhammel, *Europe, the 'West', and the Civilizing Mission* (London, 2006)
- 2006 John Breuilly, *Nationalism, Power and Modernity in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (London, 2007)
- 2007 Stig Förster, *The Battlefield: Towards a Modern History of War* (London, 2008)
- 2008 Janet L. Nelson, *Opposition to Charlemagne* (London, 2009)
- 2009 Hartmut Kaelble, *The 1970s in Europe: A Period of Disillusionment or Promise?* (London, 2010)
- 2010 *Not available*

*German Historical Institute London Bulletin*, Issue 1 (Spring, 1979)–

*German Historical Institute London Bulletin Index, 1979–1996* (London, 1996), plus supplement for the years 1997–2001

***German Historical Institute London Bulletin Supplements***

- No. 1 Indra Sengupta (ed.), *Memory, History, and Colonialism: Engaging with Pierre Nora in Colonial and Postcolonial Contexts*, with a foreword by Hagen Schulze (London, 2009)
- No. 2 Andreas Gestrich and Margrit Schulte Beerbühl (eds.), *Cosmopolitan Networks in Commerce and Society 1660–1914* (London, 2011)